MANUALS OF CATHOLIC THEOLOGY.

OUTLINES
OF
DOGMATIC THEOLOGY

SYLVESTER JOSEPH HUNTER
OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS

VOLUME I.

SECOND EDITION

NEW YORK, CINCINNATI, CHICAGO
BENZIGER BROTHERS
PRINTERS TO THE HOLY APOSTOLIC SEE | PUBLISHERS OF BENZIGER'S MAGAZINE

Nihil Obstat:

JOANNES CLAYTON, S.J.,

Præp. Prov. Anglia.

Die Julii 10, 1894.

Imprimatur:

HERBERT CARD. VAUGHAN,

Archiep. Westmonast.

Die Julii 13, 1894.

PREFACE

THE writer of this work proposes to present in three volumes, in English, an outline of a three year course of Dogmatic Theology, such as is offered to students for the priesthood in Catholic Seminaries No attempt is made to give more than the merest outline; but it is hoped that it will satisfy the needs of some who are not professional students, especially by showing the nature of the questions dealt with in each Treatise, and their proportionate importance, as indicated by the space allowed to them.

Originality would be out of place in a work of this description: the matter is the common property of theologians The admirable *Compendium* of Father Hurter is followed in the arrangement of the Treatises.

The aim of the work is Exposition, not Controversy, although controversial matter is occasionally introduced by way of illustration The writer believes that if both parties to a controversy will

give a clear exposition of what they hold upon the subject, the questions between them will quickly be brought to a decision

In the Appendix to this volume will be found a sketch of the method of disputation commonly followed in schools of philosophy and theology, by which the class are practised in the art of stating objections clearly and answering them concisely.

No attempt is made to give special prominence to questions that are attracting public attention at the time of writing It is hoped that the principles here given will enable the reader to follow intelligently the course of any theological discussion in which he may be interested, and to realize how closely the various parts of theology are linked together, so that no question can be considered as standing by itself, but must be studied in view of its connection with other branches of the science

The book is suited for the reader of English The authorities exist for the most part in Greek and Latin. These are translated or referred to in such a manner that the reader can verify the reference. The passages from the Fathers are taken from the Abbé Migne's great series, *Patres Græci* and *Patres Latini*, quoted as *P G* and *P L* respectively, and another reference is added which will guide to the passage in other editions. The

chief works quoted will be found in a convenient Latin form in Father Hurter's collection called *Opuscula Sanctorum Patrum* Detached passages are translated and arranged in Waterworth's *Faith of Catholics*. The authoritative documents of Councils and Popes are taken from Denzinger's *Enchiridion*.

The reader is supposed always to have a Bible beside him

A list of a few English books bearing on the matter of the volume will be found appended to this Preface The Catalogue of the Catholic Truth Society will give the names of popular tracts on most of the subjects dealt with in this volume.

S.J.H.

ENGLISH BOOKS THAT MAY BE CONSULTED WITH PROFIT.

The Christian Revelation

Schanz A Christian Apology Three volumes, translated from the German (Gill and Son, 1892)
Wiseman Science and Revealed Religion (Booker, 1836)
Maas Christ in Type and Prophecy (Benziger, 1893)
Maher Tatian's Diatessaron (London, 1893)
Lightfoot Essays in reply to "Supernatural Religion."
Newman Essays on Miracles

Holy Scripture

Humphrey The Written Word
Dixon General Introduction to the Sacred Scriptures.
MacDevitt Introduction to the Sacred Scriptures

The Church and the Roman Pontiff

Allies The See of St Peter
" Peter, his Name and Office
" The Formation of Christendom, and other historical Works.
Rhodes The Visible Unity of the Catholic Church
Lindsay De Ecclesia et Cathedra
Marshall Christian Missions
Bagshawe The Church
" Credentials of the Catholic Church.
Rivington Authority
" Dependence
Oakeley The Church and the Bible
Manning The Temporal Power

Faith

Manning The Grounds of Faith
Newman The Grammar of Assent
Ward The Wish to Believe

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION

1 Design 2 Theology 3 Theology, Natural and Revealed 4 Divisions of Theology 5 Subsidiary Sciences 6 Modes of Treatment 7 Is it a Science? 8 Division of the Subject 9 Method 10 Recapitulation Pp 1—10

TREATISE THE FIRST THE CHRISTIAN REVELATION

CHAPTER I THE NATURE OF REVELATION

11 Plan of the Treatise 12 Subject of the Chapter 13 Christianity Supernatural 14 The Primitive Story 15 Course of the Discussion 16 Revelation and Mystery 17 Possibility of Revelation 18 Mode of Revelation 19 Revelation why necessary 20 Recapitulation Pp 11—21

CHAPTER II CREDENTIALS OF REVELATION

21 Subject of the Chapter 22 Private Revelations 23 Public Revelations 24 Nature of Miracle 25 Moral Miracles and Miracles of Grace 26 Probative Force 27 Prophecies 28 Objections to Miracles 29 Recapitulation Pp 22—30

CHAPTER III DIFFICULTIES AGAINST MIRACLE AND PROPHECY

30 Subject of Chapter 31 Faith and Reason 32 Objections to Miracles classified 33 God unchangeable 34 Testimony untrustworthy 35 Miraculous character doubtful 36 Demonic Agency 37 Criteria of Miracles 38 Have Miracles ceased? 39. Recapitulation Pp 31—44

CHAPTER IV THE CHRISTIAN EVIDENCES PHYSICAL MIRACLES

40 Subject of Chapter 41 Early Existence of the Church Pliny 42 Tacitus 43 The Christian and other Accounts 44 Acknowledged Christian Writings 45 The Four Gospels 46 Gospel Miracles 47 Miracles as Credentials 48 The Gospels, when written 49 Manuscripts 50 Versions 51 Testimonies 52 Credibility 53 Objections 54 Recapitulation Pp 45—64

CHAPTER V PROPHECY

55 Subject of the Chapter 56 Nature of the Argument 57 Vague expectations 58 Daniel 59 An Objection answered 60 Micheas 61 Fulfilments of Prophecy 62 Other Messianic Prophecies 63 Prophetic Allusions 64 Recapitulation Pp 65—80

CHAPTER VI THE CHRISTIAN EVIDENCES MORAL MIRACLES

65 Subject of the Chapter 66 Nature of the Argument 67 Conversion of the Empire 68 This Success how accounted for 69 The Success foretold 70 Christian Morality 71 Bad Example and State Opposition 72 Recapitulation Pp 81—99

CHAPTER VII THE CERTAINTY OF THE CHRISTIAN REVELATION

73 Subject of the Chapter 74 Definitions 75 Cogency of the Argument Pp 100—103

TREATISE THE SECOND THE CHANNEL OF DOCTRINE

CHAPTER I TRADITION

76 Scope of the Treatise 77 Subject of the Chapter 78 The Rival Views 79 The Method used by Christ 80 The Charge to the Apostles 81 Action of the Apostles 82 The Second Century 83 Tertullian Prescription 84 The Work of Theology 85 Recapitulation Pp 104—117

CHAPTER II THE PROTESTANT RULE OF FAITH

86 Subject of the Chapter 87 The Protestant Rule not Scriptural 88 Prescription 89 Scripture 90 Reason 91 The Fathers 92 Recapitulation Pp 118—128

CHAPTER III MONUMENTS OF TRADITION

93 Subject of the Chapter 94 Formal Definitions 95 The Liturgy and Ritual 96 History 97 Archæology 98 The Fathers 99 Tests of Unanimity 100 Single Witnesses 101 St Augustine 102 The Doctors 103 Bishops and People 104 Recapitulation Pp 129—145

CHAPTER IV SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION

105 Subject of the Chapter 106 Tradition, prior in Time and Thought 107 Wider in Scope 108 More necessary 109 Recapitulation Pp 146—155

CHAPTER V DEVELOPMENT OF DOCTRINE

110 Subject of Chapter 111 Heresies 112 The Catholic Doctrine 113 Progress of Theology 114 The Vincentian Canon 115 Recapitulation Pp 156—166

TREATISE THE THIRD HOLY SCRIPTURE

CHAPTER I WHAT IS MEANT BY SCRIPTURE

116 Plan of the Treatise 117 Subject of the Chapter 118 "Scripture," "Bible" 119 Date of Composition 120 Original Languages 121 Writers 122 Extent 123 Style 124 Matter 125 Recapitulation Pp 167—175

CHAPTER II THE SPECIAL CHARACTER OF SCRIPTURE

126 Subject of the Chapter 127 Names given to Scripture 128 Mode of Citation 129 Decisiveness 130 Manuscripts and Versions 131 Laborious Study 132 Esteemed by the Jews 133 Heretics and Heathens 134 Recapitulation Pp 176—184

CHAPTER III INSPIRATION OF SCRIPTURE

135 Subject of the Chapter 136 Doctrine of the Church 137 The Teaching of Christ 138 Doctrine of the Apostles 139 The Fathers 140 Man's Part the Intellect 141 Man's Part the Will 142 Supervision 143 Verbal Inspiration 144 Views of Inspiration 145 Freedom from Error 146 The Fathers 147 Recapitulation Pp 185—201

CHAPTER IV THE CANON

148 Subject of the Chapter 149 The Rival Canons 150 The Canon, how determined 151 When established 152 The Old Testament 153 Recapitulation Pp 202—214

CHAPTER V VERSIONS AND INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE

154 Subject of the Chapter 155 Translation 156 Imperfect and False Renderings 157 The Church and the Versions 158 The Vulgate 159 Interpretation of Scripture 160 The Use of Versions 161 Recapitulation Pp 215—226

TREATISE THE FOURTH THE CHURCH

CHAPTER I EXISTENCE OF THE CHURCH

162 Plan of Treatise 163 Subject of the Chapter 164 Meaning of "Church" 165 Church and Churches 166 The Church Perennial 167 Proof of Perennity 168 The Church Visible 169 Proof of Visibility 170 Difficulties against Visibility 171 Recapitulation Pp 227—243

CHAPTER II THE END OF THE CHURCH

172 Subject of the Chapter 173 Meaning of "Society" 174 Societies classified 175 Family, State, and Church 176 The Church Supernatural 177 Christ the Head, the Church the Body 178 The Mystic Body 179 The Three Societies 180 The Ends compared 181 Duty of Membership 182 Recapitulation Pp 244—256

CHAPTER III THE MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH

183 Subject of the Chapter 184 Terms defined 185 Figures of the Church 186 Soul and Body of the Church 187 Who belong to the Soul 188 Who belong to the Body 189 Various Errors 190 The Predestined 191 The Just 192 Difficulties 193 Heresy 194 Children of Heretics 195 Catechumens 196 Excommunication 197 Schism 198 Recapitulation Pp 257—282

CHAPTER IV CONSTITUTION AND POWERS OF THE CHURCH

199 Subject of the Chapter 200 Governors and Governed 201 The Protestant Views 202 Source of Authority 203 Authority to Teach 204 The Protestant System 205 The Church Infallible 206 Proofs of Infallibility 207 Objections against Infallibility 208 Seat of Infallibility 209 Extent of Infallibility 210 Faith and Morals 211 Dogmatic Facts 212 Recapitulation Pp 283—314

CHAPTER V UNITY OF THE CHURCH

213 Subject of Chapter 214 Properties of the Church 215 Catholic Doctrine on Unity 216 Schism 217 The Donatists 218 The Great Schism 219 Errors as to Unity 220 Unity of Faith 221 Unity of Worship 222 The Diptychs 223 Letters 224 Unity of Government. 225 Objections 226 Riva Views 227 Recapitulation Pp 315—344

CHAPTER VI SANCTITY OF THE CHURCH
228 Subject of the Chapter 229 Meaning of Holiness 230 The Church Holy 231 Heroic Sanctity 232 The Church Holy in her Members 233 Worldly Success 234 Objections 235 Miracles 236 Recapitulation Pp 345—359

CHAPTER VII CATHOLICITY OF THE CHURCH
237 Subject of the Chapter 238 Meaning of "Catholic" 239 The Church of Christ Catholic 240 Early Testimonies 241 Force of the Proof 242 Recapitulation Pp 360—364

CHAPTER VIII APOSTOLICITY OF THE CHURCH
243 Subject of the Chapter 244 Meaning of "Apostle" 245 Later Use 246 The Church Apostolic 247 Recapitulation Pp 365—370

CHAPTER IX. NOTES OF THE CHURCH
248 Subject of the Chapter 249 Notes of the Church 250 Christian Communities classified 251 The Unprelatic. 252 The Prelatic. 253 The Easterns 254 The Roman Church Unity 255 Sanctity 256 Catholicity 257 Apostolicity 258 Objections 259 Recapitulation Pp 371—390

TREATISE THE FIFTH THE ROMAN PONTIFF.

CHAPTER I POSITION OF THE POPE IN THE CHURCH
260 Plan of Treatise. 261 Subject of Chapter 262 Who is the Pope? 263 Papal Functions classified 264 Action of Pope as Teacher 265 Papal Legislation 266 The Pope and the Bishops 267 Liturgy 268 Mode of Exercise. 269 Prescription. 270 Recapitulation Pp 391—407

CHAPTER II WHO WAS ST PETER?
271 Subject of Chapter 272 St Peter, Bishop of Rome 273 The First of the Apostles 274 A Dignity Promised 275 Assistance Promised 276 The Dignity Conferred 277 The Acts and Epistles 278, St Paul and St Peter 279 Recapitulation . . . Pp 408—427

it holds in the general scheme; and references will be given, as far as possible, to English authors, in whose works further information can most conveniently be sought

2 *Theology*.—The word "Theology" signifies "A discourse on God," as its derivation shows (Θεός, λόγος) In its widest sense, therefore, it would include all systematic study which in any way concerns God or His works; including, therefore, the study of Nature, organic or inorganic, and of Man as revealed in history. But to take the word so very widely would be to fritter away the distinction of the sciences, and lead to confusion instead of orderly knowledge. It is well, therefore, that actual usage has very much restricted the meaning of the word

3 *Theology, Natural and Revealed.*—A knowledge of the existence of God, our Creator and Lord, can be attained with certainty by man contemplating the world around him, by the exercise of the natural power of his reason This truth is defined by the Vatican Council, in the second Chapter, on Revelation, and will be explained and proved hereafter in its proper place, in the second volume of our work The knowledge of the Being and the Attributes of God which can be gained in this way, constitutes the science of Natural Theology, which is a branch of Philosophy (See Father Boedder's work in the series called Stonyhurst Manuals of Catholic Philosophy).

The knowledge of God which Natural Theology teaches, however solid and valuable, is far from

being all that we can know concerning Him, for, as will be shown in its proper place (Treatise I), it has pleased God to give to the human race a Revelation concerning Himself, by which our natural knowledge of His being and of His dealings with us is confirmed and immensely enlarged. The knowledge that we gain through this Revelation constitutes Theology in the proper sense of the term, and it is of this that we treat in these Outlines.

4 *Divisions of Theology.*—St Thomas, in his *Summa Theologica*, designed to treat of the whole of Theology in the sense just explained, having dealt with Natural Theology in his *Summa contra Gentes*. But death prevented the completion of his work, and subsequent writers have found that the design is too vast, no satisfactory result can be obtained unless the matter is broken up, especially because the different parts are found to require each its own appropriate method of treatment. Accordingly, besides Dogmatic Theology (*τὰ δογματα ὄντα*), or Doctrine, with which we are here chiefly concerned, there are authors who treat of Moral Theology, or the rules which God has laid down as obligatory upon all men as guides of their conduct (*mores*), Ascetic Theology (*ἀσκησις*), which, so far as it can be distinguished from Moral and Mystic, may be described as giving the rules for those who aspire to a closer union with God than is obligatory upon all, and who receive from Him that help without which they cannot secure this happiness, and Mystic Theology, which deals mainly with those

extraordinary favours which God is pleased from time to time to bestow upon certain persons, not primarily for their own benefit, but for the benefit of others This word Mystic is derived from the same root (*μύω*) as Mystery, but by usage the two words bear different meanings, all truths known by Revelation are called Mysteries, however simple in themselves, thus we speak of the Mysteries of the Rosary, which are familiar to all Christians, but Mystic Theology is concerned with the visions of the saints, and the like The boundary lines between Moral, Ascetic, and Mystic are not clearly defined

5 *Subsidiary Sciences* —All other sciences are in a sense subsidiary to Theology, for this is immediately concerned with God, the Source of all things, and Whose knowledge embraces the very truth about all things actual and possible But there are some branches of knowledge which subserve Theology in a more direct manner Chief among these is Philosophy, which discusses the general principles upon which all knowledge depends, and certain questions concerning existing things, especially, Philosophy is useful as exposing the futility of attempts that are sometimes made to prove that certain truths contained in Revelation are self-contradictory the Real Presence of the Body of our Lord under the accidents of bread, for example The theologian ought to be acquainted with certain parts of Physics, both in the ancient and the modern forms of the science, for otherwise he will be unable to understand the writings of divines of former ages,

or to explain himself to men of his own day He ought to possess himself of some portions of History and Archæology, which teach what have been God's dealings with His rational creatures, and of Canon Law and Liturgical science, which show what has been the action of that Society which God has established for the purpose of guiding men to Him.

It is part of the proper subject of Theology to discuss the precise character of the writings which constitute Holy Scripture, and distinguish them from all other writings, also, to lay down certain rules as to the authority that attaches to the Fathers of the Church. Again, since Theology founds some of its arguments upon particular passages of these monuments of antiquity, it necessarily discusses fully the precise meaning of these passages But it is not necessary for Theology to give a continuous commentary upon Holy Scripture and the Patristic writings; the interpreter, however, no less than the historian, must have before his eyes the teachings of Theology, as the norm to which his expositions must conform This rule results from the certainty which Theology attains, which is higher than the certainty that can be ascribed to any interpretation of a text or historical view This is explained in the sixth Treatise, on Faith. (n 319)

6 *Modes of Treatment.*—Christian writers of all times have left us commentaries, sermons, letters, and treatises on particular points of doctrine, directed against various errors as they have arisen;

and by the study of these writings it is possible to ascertain what was the belief of the writers on various points But for a thousand years or more, little attempt was made to systematize the body of doctrine, and to show how it formed a coherent whole Afterwards, however, this work was done by the labour of the Schoolmen, so called because the earliest of them taught in the schools, which having been established in cities and monasteries through the act or influence of Charlemagne, grew into the Universities of mediæval Europe St Anselm, who died in 1109, is commonly reckoned the first of the Schoolmen, just as St Bernard was the last of the Fathers, having closed his life in 1153

Scholastic Theology is, therefore, a particular treatment of the subject, where every term is precisely defined, doctrine is clearly stated without superfluous matter, order is strictly observed, the questions *why?* and *how?* are raised and answered, and objections are put shortly but plainly and replied to in the same manner In contradistinction from this, *Positive Theology* does not concern itself with formal definitions, adopts a flowing style, chooses its matter with a view to some practical object, ignores all subtle inquiry into the reason and manner of things, and incorporates the answers to difficulties in the general discourse

The difference between Positive and Scholastic Theology is then a difference of method, not of Doctrine It happens, however, that most of the great Scholastics followed one system of Philosophy,

founded on that of Aristotle, from which it resulted that this body of philosophical doctrine received the name of Scholastic Philosophy, and under this name it still holds its own in most Catholic schools, witnessing the rise and fall of countless rival systems

A third method of treating Theology was rendered necessary by the circumstances of the sixteenth century The teachers who carried a large part of Europe with them at that time, were not content with denying one or another point of Catholic doctrine, but they attacked the system as a whole and in every point To meet them it was necessary to establish the authority of the Church, which had not been called in question in previous ages, and also to defend all particular doctrines against a new method of attack This Controversy or Polemic Theology (πόλεμος, war) was put into shape by Cardinal Bellarmine, whose method can scarcely be improved upon, and Polemics still continue to be a principal, but by no means the only, employment of a theologian The result of the discussions of the last three centuries has been the separation of one portion of Polemics, and its formation into a compact whole, which goes by the name of Apologetics or Fundamental Theology Its nature will be explained directly (n 8) A judicious combination of Positive, Scholastic, and Controversy is what is required at the present day. (See n 84) It will be remembered that St Ignatius of Loyola lays it down as one of the Rules for preserving harmony of feeling with the Church

(Rule 11), that we must approve of both Positive and Scholastic Theology, each being useful in its place He wrote before Polemic had taken shape

7 *Is it a Science?*—The question is sometimes raised, whether Theology is a science The answer is that it is not a science in the sense of being founded on self-evident principles, like Geometry, for its principles, while they are supremely certain, are of a different nature from those of other sciences But it deserves to be called a science, and the chief of sciences, on account of the pre-eminent certainty of its principles, as shall be explained when we treat of Faith (Treatise VI)

8 *Division of Subject*—In the arrangement of our matter, we shall for the most part follow the order adopted by St Thomas in his *Summa* The Saint first treats of God, one Substance existing in three Persons, then of the creatures of God, especially the rational creatures, the Angels and Man. He then discusses the end for which man was created, and how he is to attain that end, by the use of his free-will, and it is here that Moral, Ascetic, and Mystic Theology would find their place did our design extend to them Afterwards we have the Treatise on the Incarnation, inasmuch as Christ is the way by which man attains his end, on Grace, and on the Sacraments, the great means by which the benefit of the work of Christ is applied to individual souls Had not death interfered, St. Thomas would have finished the work by Treatises on the Four Last Things.

This sufficed in the thirteenth century, when no one called in question the authority of the Church But at the present day, as already explained (n 6), it is necessary to add certain Treatises which are especially Polemical, inquiring what is the True Religion, which will be shown to be the Christian Revelation, what are the sources of our knowledge of this Revelation, namely Tradition and Scripture, what the position of the Church as guardian of Revelation, and her constitution, which is monarchical, under the Roman Pontiff The name of Fundamental Theology is sometimes given to this group of five Treatises, with which it is convenient to begin A sixth Treatise, on Faith, completes the volume

9 *Method* —In discussing each point in its turn, we shall in general observe the following order. First we shall point out how the question arises, and what room there is for difference of opinion consistent with the truths that are considered as already established at this place, this will involve all necessary explanation of the terms employed. The Catholic doctrine will then be stated, or if the point be open, then that which seems preferable, and proof of it will be given derived from the three great *loci*, Scripture, Tradition, and Reason, where by Reason is meant not merely the pure unassisted reason of man, but more commonly theological reason, that is to say, the analogy of other parts of revealed doctrine Objections that may be raised against the doctrine will then be considered, if necessary, but it will often be found that they have

been anticipated in the introductory explanation, for difficulties are very commonly based on an *ignoratio elenchi* mistake of the point

10 *Recapitulation* —So far we have explained the nature of Theology and its branches, Dogmatic, Fundamental, Moral, Ascetic, and Mystic, also the different modes in which it can be treated, Positive, Scholastic, and Polemic The convenient distribution of the subject was then shown, and the arrangement which will here be observed in the treatment of each question.

Treatise the First.

The Christian Revelation.

CHAPTER I.

THE NATURE OF REVELATION.

11. *Plan of the Treatise.*—In this Treatise we shall show in successive chapters, first what is meant by the Revelation of a Mystery and that such Revelation is possible. Then that Miracles and Prophecy are possible, and that they may serve as the credentials of one who claims to be commissioned to proclaim a Divine revelation. Thirdly, that Miracles and Prophecy attest the claim of Christ to be considered a Divine Messenger. Lastly, it will be pointed out as the result of this discussion that the Divine origin of the Christian Revelation is certain but not evident.

12. *Subject of Chapter.*—The first chapter will point out the supernatural character claimed by the Christian religion, and we shall study the nature and necessity of revelation.

13. *Christianity Supernatural.*—It can scarcely be seriously disputed that Christianity claims to be a supernatural religion. Its leading doctrines, the

Trinity in Unity and the Incarnation, are thoroughly supernatural they could not possibly have been known to be true, except by revelation from God, and even assuming that they have been revealed, the natural powers of man are totally incompetent to understand the intrinsic reasons on which they depend those who accept them do so purely on the authority of God Moreover, the proof that Christians adduce to justify their belief that God has spoken is itself supernatural; for it depends upon a succession of prophecies and upon miracles, of which the principal is the Resurrection of our Lord from the dead And further, Christianity holds out to man a final destiny beyond the powers of his nature or that of any creature, and offers him supernatural help, to enable him to attain this destiny A religion which is supernatural in its doctrines, its credentials, and its aims, certainly claims to be called supernatural By "supernatural" we understand what surpasses the powers of a creature the fuller discussion of this most important term will find a place when we treat of the condition of our first parents before their sin.

14. *The Primitive Story* —That Christianity as it now exists, and is professed by the great bulk of its followers claims to be supernatural, will be generally admitted but it is sometimes said that this was not the primitive character of the religion. There are those who profess the highest respect for the teaching of Christ and avow themselves His followers, but declare that He never aspired to a higher character than that of a purely human

instructor in a sublime system of morality, and whatever else is attributed to Him is, they say, a later corruption These men will quote with admiration the Sermon on the Mount, and the verse where St James teaches that pure religion is to visit the fatherless and the widows in their affliction (St James i. 27), and they add that St John the Evangelist, in his old age, had no last lesson to inculcate upon his disciples except mutual love, as St. Jerome tells us in his commentary upon the last chapter of the Epistle of St Paul to the Galatians (*P.L* 26, 433), where St Paul exhorts his disciples to work good to all men, and to bear one another's burdens In all this, they say, there is admirable morality, but nothing of the supernatural, or of the subtleties of theological doctrine

This patronizing tone was adopted as long ago as the third century by Porphyry, as we learn from Eusebius (*Præp Evang* 3, *P G* 22, 236) Socinus was driven to it, as an escape from the doctrinal strife of the early Protestant sects in the sixteenth century. It was adopted by the English deists of the Georgian era, from whom it was borrowed by the German Lessing, whose influence is still felt in his own country Renan has made the view popular in France, and it prevails extensively in England, being preached by many popular writers It is probably rife among some Freemasons

We have here to deal with one of those worst of falsehoods which are half a truth There is no height of charity or other natural virtue so sublime but what Christianity invites men to aspire to it,

furnishing them with potent helps in the endeavour, and motives and examples But along with this, as we have shown, the religion has a marked supernatural character The bases of Christianity are found in the books of Holy Scripture, especially of the New Testament, which as they are commonly read are full of narratives and discourses which admit of no natural explanation Accordingly, in all ages those who are not content to accept Christianity as it was left by its Founder, have asserted that these books have been largely interpolated, or that their true date is far later than is commonly supposed Thus, they refuse to admit the authority of the Gospel of St John, and of many of the Epistles, but those who go furthest in this line will admit that the three Synoptic Gospels represent the original story, as do also the Acts of the Apostles, and four at least of the Epistles of St Paul those to the Romans and Galatians and the two to the Corinthians But even from these they cut out the miraculous narratives as being spurious interpolations, and explain as best they can such passages as those in St Matthew (xi 25) and St Luke (x 21), where our Lord thanks His Father for the fulness of the revelation that He has granted to the little ones of earth We shall prove the authenticity and genuineness of the Gospels in its proper place (nn 48—53), but we must here call attention to the utter untrustworthiness of the line of argument which rejects passages from an author on purely internal grounds, though such grounds may have a certain weight when they go along with other

circumstances. For instance, there is not a particle of external objection to the account given by St Matthew (i 19) of the miraculous conception of our Lord it is found in all the manuscripts and versions To reject it as an interpolation and then to argue from the silence of the document, thus manipulated, as showing that there was nothing supernatural in the original story, is a plain begging of the question. A course like this seems to have been adopted by the Manicheans, and elicited a protest from St. Augustine. (*De Utilitate Credendi*, c 3, n. 7, *P L.* 42, 69)

15 *Course of the Discussion.*—We might at once proceed to show that this claim of Christianity to be a supernatural revelation is in fact well founded, after which it would be superfluous to prove that such revelation is possible. But it will be instructive first to discuss the grounds alleged by some writers for believing that nothing of the sort can happen, and to show their futility In this discussion, we shall assume as granted the existence of God, the all-wise and all-powerful Creator of all things This truth will, of course, be proved in its proper place, in the second volume

16 *Revelation and Mystery.*—Revelation is the making known of something which was previously unknown the unfolding of a mystery. Mysteries are of various kinds The thing may be in itself cognizable by the senses, which, however, have no opportunity of receiving the necessary impression. thus, it is a mystery to me how much money my neighbour has in his pocket, and the state of things

signs, such as language. The origin of this power is unknown to us, but its existence is proved by every day's experience. There is, therefore, nothing to prevent God, if He pleases, communicating with us, and we must not call this in doubt merely because we do not see how it is done.

St. Thomas (*Summa Theol.* 1. q. 111, a. 1. and 2. 2. q. 172, a. 2.) teaches that revelations are brought from God to man through the ministry of angels. The various modes that are recorded to have been employed are collected by St. Augustine in a sermon which is sometimes called his 12th, on Scripture, sometimes his 16th, *de Diversis* (*P.L.* 38, 102). He puts the Holy Scripture in the first place as containing messages to us from God, but the same purpose may be served in several other ways. It is to be observed that the power of communicating with another involves the power of making that other know from whom the communication comes, for the gift of language would be useless to me if I could not ensure my friend knowing that what he hears is my voice, and not the voice of a stranger, or perhaps the roaring of the wind. Mistakes are possible, but they are exceptional, and so also, if true revelations may be given but not recognized as such, or their existence may be unproved without

been within his reach without requiring the knowledge of Divine mysteries. But as a matter of fact, the end for which man is destined surpasses his natural powers, as will be shown in its proper place And this is a great benefit to man, not only on account of the high destiny that is placed within his reach, but also because the method of guidance by the revelation of mysteries is specially suited to man's mental nature. Man has a constant natural craving to know something of the secrets of God, and this craving is satisfied by the Christian Revelation, for the contemplation of its truths has afforded full employment to some of the greatest intellects that the world has seen to St Augustine, St Anselm, and St Thomas When this revelation is rejected, men endeavour to satisfy their craving by such means as they think suitable this is proved by the devotion of the Neo-Platonists of the fourth century to magic, and of the Priscillianists to astrology in the fifth: this art was cultivated by the votaries of revived paganism at the time of the Renaissance, among whom also the study of the Cabbala found favour During the excesses of the French Revolution these modes of seeking to pry into mysteries had great vogue; and in our own time, men seek to replace Christianity by Esoteric Buddhism, Spiritism, and the like. Further, all instruction necessarily begins with an exercise of faith on the part of the pupil, who accepts much that he cannot understand simply upon the authority of the teacher and unless he do this heartily, he will make little progress, as will be seen if we consider the process

of teaching the beginning of any art or science Man on earth is beginning to learn a lesson which he is destined to know perfectly in the world beyond the grave. the boast, therefore, of Rationalists of all ages that they believe nothing upon mere authority is false in fact as well as unreasonable in theory This is excellently pointed out by St. Augustine, in his book, *De Utilitate Credendi* (*P.L.* 42, 63—92), directed against the Manicheans, the Rationalists of his day, and his arguments are still applicable Especially he insists that the Christian Revelation does not call upon men to believe absurdities, which important point calls for illustration. No part of it is contradictory to any other part, or to any truth which our intellect perceives to be certain and necessary. (n. 322.) Apparent cases of the kind are met with, but they will be found on examination to depend either upon a misunderstanding of the true doctrine, or upon a hasty assumption that what is ordinarily true is true necessarily, so as not to admit an exception even by miracle For instance, our experience shows us that each substance is regularly accompanied by its own set of accidents, but no man can ever prove that this is necessarily so, and thus the doctrine that in the Blessed Eucharist the Body of Christ exists under the accidents of bread, does not contradict any known truth, but merely furnishes an exception to the rule which is found to be ordinarily observed We decline to discuss the supposition of a Divine revelation being given which contradicts a known truth, for this supposition is impossible. (n. 322.) God *cannot* contradict Himself,

whether He speaks by nature or by revelation; and any communication which purported to be a revelation would be at once discredited if it were shown to contradict known truth. In the words of the Vatican Council (fourth chapter of the First Constitution), "Although Faith be above Reason, yet between Faith and Reason there never can be true variance" (Denz. 1645). Lastly, we may conjecture that God chose this way of training men by the revelation of mysteries in order to help them in combating pride, which refuses to take the humble position of a learner, as well as disclaims all subjection to law, and thus is the source of all the sins that are committed.

20 *Recapitulation.*—We have seen in this chapter that Christianity claims, and has always claimed to be a supernatural religion; we have explained the nature of mysteries, and have shown that Revelation is possible and suited to our nature. As will be remembered (n. 15), we have throughout assumed provisionally the being and providence of God, the discussion of which will have place in our second volume.

CHAPTER II.

CREDENTIALS OF REVELATION.

21. *Subject of the Chapter.*—In the following chapter we shall explain the nature of Revelation, and show how its existence can be attested by miracles and prophecies

22. *Private Revelations.*—We have seen (n 18) that God can speak to His creature in such a way as to leave the recipient of the communication in no doubt as to the Source from which it comes, but such communications are exceptional, and do not now concern us, unless they are intended to be published and to command the acceptance of other persons It belongs to Mystic Theology to discuss the precautions to be observed in order to guard against delusion in these cases, while Ascetic Theology discusses the continually occurring cases where the Creator speaks to His creatures, truly, but in a way which is not always easy to distinguish from the thoughts that are generated by the natural power of the mind Those Divine communications which are intended for the benefit of the recipient alone, need no public credentials

23 *Public Revelations.*—But it is quite otherwise with Public Revelations, the name given to those

Revelations which are received by one person, but are intended to be communicated by him to others, and to command their submissive acceptance. This submission cannot reasonably be demanded unless the person who claims the character of a Divine messenger produce full proof that he has warrant for his claim Belief in every message that purports to come from God, without proof that the messenger is neither deceiver nor deceived, so far from being a duty or even a virtue, may easily be a sin of imprudence, as true a sin, though not as great a sin, as that of the man who rejects a message that comes to him from God through a messenger who shows such proofs of his authority as cannot prudently be called in question

It is hard to conceive any mode in which such a messenger could be accredited, except Miracles and Prophecies, and the Christian Revelation claims to be accredited by these means We must, therefore, proceed to consider the nature of Miracles, the possibility of recognizing them, and the manner in which they afford proof that a revelation is truly Divine. The same points will also be considered in regard to Prophecies

In this part of our subject, as in the preceding chapter, we postulate the existence of God, the all-perfect Creator of the universe. The justice of this postulate will be vindicated hereafter.

24 *Nature of Miracle* —The nature of what is meant by Miracle will be best understood by an example We will make a supposition which we do not at present assert to have ever been realized, we

put it as a supposition which no one can show to be impossible, it involves no contradiction Suppose then that an adult man who has been blind from his birth meets another man, who says to him, Receive your sight, and at this mere word the power of vision comes on the instant to him who had been blind Such an event as this is well calculated to excite the marvel of bystanders, and of all who learn what has happened, the occurrence has therefore one of the elements that go to constitute a public miracle It is marvellous

What can be the cause of this man having suddenly gained the power of sight? The ordinary process of growth gives sight to some animals, such as kittens which are born blind The surgeon's knife removes a cataract, and gives or restores sight to the patient But the case before us is ascribable neither to natural growth nor to human agency, it cannot be a mere coincidence that the recovery took place at the very instant that the command was received, but it must have been in some sense caused or occasioned by this word But in the ordinary course of things, no such effect follows upon words, the occurrence is something which is out of the ordinary course of nature This is a second element in the idea of a miracle

What then is the origin of this event? It is neither material nor human. it must, therefore, either come directly from God or from some spiritual beings other than those through whom, as Christians believe, the providence of God is exercised on the earth I do not now assert the

existence of such spirits, or beings distinct from matter I am putting all conceivable suppositions; but no one can show that the existence of such spirits is impossible, as involving a contradiction nor that the Christian belief is false, according to which some of these spirits are good, and act according to directions received from God, others bad, who are permitted by Him to exercise some part of their natural power, others perhaps neither good nor bad, in any marked degree, but who if they exist must for our purpose reckon as bad Since good spirits act as ministers of God, their action may be spoken of as His, and therefore we may say that such an occurrence as we have supposed must be the work either of God or of evil spirits, and if the incident stand alone, we can say no more about it, it may be a Divine work, but we cannot say that it certainly is such, for want of full knowledge of the powers which evil spirits are allowed to exercise We cannot be sure that what has occurred is a miracle in the proper sense of the word, it may be the work of God, but we cannot be sure that it is so, it may be supernatural, but it may also be merely preternatural.

25. *Moral Miracles and Miracles of Grace.*—The incident which we have been discussing, if a miracle at all, is a miracle in the physical order it concerns a material object, a man's eye. But we may make another supposition, again without asserting more than its possibility, we do not here say that it ever was verified Suppose a whole population devoted to practices the most attractive to human nature,

suddenly to abandon these practices, at the word of a preacher, and to embrace a life full of incidents most repulsive to that nature; and further, to persevere in this way of living even though all who were detected as belonging to the association were put to death amid horrible torments If this happened, we should say it was something out of accord with the ordinary course of human conduct, it would be a marvel calling for explanation, no less than the grant of sight to the blind man, and it cannot be an effect in ordinary course of the preacher's word It must be either a moral miracle or possibly the work of an evil spirit.

Further, Christians believe that God ordinarily grants to men a certain measure of the peculiar influence called Grace, but that He sometimes may grant this favour in an altogether extraordinary abundance, they therefore speak of miracles of grace, as when a person embraces the true religion under circumstances of peculiar difficulty Christians may often notice cases which seem to be miracles of grace in this sense, but the matter is always involved in considerable obscurity, so that miracles of this class will seldom or never be capable of serving as credentials for a preacher, especially as their very possibility postulates much which cannot be proved until the whole Christian Revelation is established It is otherwise with moral miracles, which are often less open to cavil than those of the physical order.

26 *Probative Force.*—So far we have been regarding the extraordinary occurrence as standing

alone Now suppose, what is certainly possible, that the man whose word was followed by the gift of sight, went on to declare that he was a messenger sent by God, and that God had granted sight to the blind man for the purpose of showing that this mission had His sanction. What now is the position of a bystander, or of one who, though not himself present, receives an authentic account of what has occurred? Are they to accept the message as the voice of God, and order their lives in accordance with it? Not necessarily Prudence requires that they should look carefully into the matter, it would not be right to recognize the messenger as a Divine teacher without further consideration, any more than it would be prudent and right to neglect his claim altogether The matter demanded inquiry. This inquiry will be directed to the question whether the message which purports to be a revelation, in any respect contradicts what is already known of the mind of God, either as He speaks in nature, or by previous ascertained revelations If so, the new revelations must be at once rejected, as St. Paul teaches (Galat. i. 9): "If any one preach to you a gospel besides that which you have received, let him be anathema" (See also Deut xiii. 1—5) Either the marvel was the work of an evil spirit, designed to perplex men and lead them from the truth, or this work is not so connected with the message as to afford sanction to it. Thus no one who accepts the Christian Revelation can hesitate whether it is a duty or even allowable to listen to the messages

which are conveyed to men by spirit-rapping. These rappers uniformly deny the existence and eternity of Hell, and so they contradict a revelation which God has already made; so far, therefore, as these indications are not mere trickery, they come from evil spirits This negative test will generally be sufficient, and perhaps all grounds for rejecting the claim of the messenger can be reduced to it, but if, after due inquiry, no reason is discovered for refusing to admit his claim, he must be received as a messenger from God, and his message adopted as the rule of our belief and life From the nature of the case, even apart from the Divine veracity, it is impossible that a falsehood should ever come before us in such guise that we should be *forced* to regard it as truth (n 313) God does not suffer us to be made the helpless victims of the malice of the devils or of the fraud or folly of men. We are never necessitated to believe a lie, as would be the case if a marvel attesting a falsehood came before us in such shape that we could not help regarding it as a Divine miracle

27 *Prophecies* —What has been said of miracles is easily adapted to the case of prophecies A writer points out within a year or two the exact date, at least some two centuries after his time, at which a child was to be born who should by his influence revolutionize the world, although he himself was put to a violent death by his enemies, if all this comes about at the proper time, we feel that no human intelligence can have seen so far into

the future, but that the writer must have been admitted to a share in the Divine foreknowledge. The probative force of a prophecy is of the same nature as that of a miracle

28 *Objections to Miracles.*—So far we have exhibited the proof, belonging properly to Philosophy, which explains the doctrine laid down by the Vatican Council (Const I. c. III on Faith, and the fourth of the corresponding Canons), that miracles are possible and that they can sometimes be known by us (Denz 1639) It is hardly necessary to quote passages of Scripture to show that this doctrine is part of the Christian Revelation It is enough to refer as to miracles to St John x. 37, 38, where Christ says, "If I do not the work of My Father, believe Me not but if I do, though you will not believe Me, believe the works," and for prophecy, to Deut xviii 18—22, where we see that prophecy has for a principal purpose to accredit a messenger, and not so much to forewarn as to the future

An immense number of difficulties have been raised against this doctrine of the possibility of miracles, their cognoscibility and their probative force, most of which, however, disappear when applied to a concrete instance such as we have supposed The matter is, as will be readily understood, of first-rate importance, and much light is thrown upon it by the solution of the difficulties that have been raised, we will therefore devote a chapter to the discussion of the different forms that these difficulties have t[illegible]en

29 *Recapitulation*.—In the present chapter we have distinguished between public and private revelation, and said that public revelations must be attested by miracles and prophecies, these are shown to be possible, to be sometimes recognizable, and to have force to accredit one who claims to be a Divine messenger.

CHAPTER III.

DIFFICULTIES AGAINST MIRACLE AND PROPHECY.

30. *Subject of Chapter.*—The difficulties which are raised against the possibility of Miracles admit of a four-fold classification The varieties of form that may be given to each class of objection are infinite; we here point out the general nature of the reply. Certain tests of true miracles will be mentioned, and it will be shown that a sweeping denial of their occurrence at the present day is baseless.

31 *Faith and Reason.*—The question which engaged us in the last chapter is, and has for some three centuries been the principal battle-ground between those who acknowledge and those who reject the claims made by the Christian Revelation. If miracles and prophecies are impossible, they have not occurred, but we cannot conceive a revelation demanding the absolute submission of men, if it be not accredited by these evidences: hence, if they be impossible, no revelation can do more than set before men a system of religious doctrine which they are at liberty to discuss, and accept or reject according to the judgment which their reason forms of its value. The term Rationalist is applied to all who believe

that they are at liberty to deal in this way with the Christian Revelation It is a misleading word, because it seems to imply that this school, and they alone, follow the guidance of Reason, while Christians abandon Reason in favour of some opposing principle or faculty called Faith This is an utterly false representation A Christian exercises Faith in believing the truths which God has revealed, but he is always ready to obey the Apostolic precept (1 St Peter III. 15), and give a reason of the hope that is in him In fact, he holds it to be most irrational to refuse to accept instruction which comes from a competent teacher, unless it recommend itself to his own reason He must use his reason to scrutinize the grounds on which he believes in the teacher's competence, and if any part of the teaching seem to contradict what he learns from his reason, he must examine the matter, and, supposing him to be dealing with the Christian Revelation, he will find that the contradiction is only apparent On the other hand, the proofs of the existence of the Christian miracles are so clear and manifold that probably they are felt to be conclusive by all who frankly and heartily admit the possibility of a revelation being made known by these means If any man remain unconvinced when the reasons for believing the miracles that attest the Christian Revelation are set before him, it will generally be found that this man does not really believe in the possibility of miracles he may not openly deny this possibility, but the denial is lurking in his mind, unsuspected perhaps by himself, and effec-

tually hinders his giving fair consideration to the historical evidence, of the falsehood of which he is convinced beforehand.

32 *Objections to Miracles classified* —The importance of the question of the possibility of Miracles is felt on all sides, and as may be expected, the literature of the subject is very large. We can do no more in this place than give the briefest sketch of different classes of difficulties that are raised by the opponents of Revelation, with indications of the line of answer. The precise shape that the objection takes may vary indefinitely, and the answer would require corresponding modification. Some of the difficulties are founded on the nature of God, and the mode in which He governs the world, others on the difficulty of attaining certainty as to past events; a third class urges that it is impossible to distinguish what occurrences are in accordance with the course of nature, and a fourth rests on the possibility of the agency of evil spirits We will treat these four classes of objection separately, but first we remark that we by no means maintain that Miracles can always be recognized with certainty, but only that they can sometimes be recognized The person who has discerned that certain Miracles have actually occurred will be ready to recognize the miraculous character in other events which would be ambiguous if they stood by themselves A skilful connoisseur who has studied the undoubted works of a great artist will certainly recognize his hand in some newly discovered painting, although he may be wholly unable to convey to others the conviction

which he feels so a Christian may feel assured of the miraculous character of an occurrence which he would never dream of putting forward as calculated to convince one who did not agree with him as to the true character of other works which he has seen to be demonstrably the immediate work of God (See n 63)

33. *God unchangeable* —The first class of objectors urge that God is unchangeable, that in creating the universe He gave it fixed laws by which it should be regulated, and that any interference with these laws implies imperfection, as though the work of the Creator required patching, to meet unforeseen emergencies

This objection, turning on the immutability of the infinite Being, is urged with at least as much force against the possibility of creation as against miracles, and it receives full consideration from philosophers (see Father Boedder, *Natural Theology*, 422, seq) and theologians in the proper place. It may here be enough to say that when God works a miracle, this act does not involve any interior change in Him the unchanging will that He has had from all eternity is manifested outwardly, and that is all· He can be called by the new name of Miracle-worker, but to receive a new name works no interior change in the person or thing to whom it is applied

When the objector speaks of the unchanging laws of the universe, he uses a phrase which is liable to mislead These so-called laws are nothing but a generalization formed by the human mind on

observing the course of the universe It is true that this is ordinarily uniform, because it is in truth the resultant of the interaction of various portions of matter, which God in the act of creating endowed with certain powers, and which exercise these powers as long as He pleases to conserve them in their being If this conservation, which is in truth perpetual creation, were withheld, the creature would cease to exist, it would fall to nothingness, and the result might have the characters of a miracle but this is not the way in which God acts, as St Thomas teaches. (1. q 104 a 4) Also, a miraculous effect might be produced if God exercised again His creative power, which was not exhausted by the initial act which brought the world into existence, but neither is this likely to be the way employed, for probably the quantity of matter in the world has remained unchanged, without increase or diminution, since the beginning Physical miracles are therefore to be referred to the action of God Himself, acting either immediately, for He can by His immediate action do whatever He ordinarily does through the activity of second causes (St Thomas, 1 q 105 a. 2.), or more probably using the ministry of good angels, through whom He exercises His ordinary providence over the world, as will be shown in its proper place, when Creation comes before us (See St. Thomas, 1. q. 110 a 1)

If it be urged that such action of immaterial beings as we here suppose is inconsistent with that principle of Conservation of Energy, which is made the basis of modern physics, we answer that the

proof of this principle is found in an induction from the results of experiment, and cannot claim greater accuracy than that of the fundamental instruments, the balance, pendulum, and the like; besides which, the precise physical circumstances of a miracle have never been measured with the care which would be needed to test the question No rational man can pretend that the principle is proved in such a sense as to assure us that no man born blind ever received his sight. If it be said that *if* the balance and the rest were properly applied they *would* always show that no immaterial agent ever affects man's body, this is a mere unproved assumption, and amounts to a *petitio principii* It may be said with equal fairness that the presence of an immaterial agent would make itself manifest, if the opportunity arose of testing the matter, and, experiment being out of the question, there is no means of deciding between these conflicting assertions

Lastly, it is quite a misrepresentation to speak of a miracle as a patching up of an order which has been found to be imperfect The ordinary course of nature is good in its place, and when the occasion arises the miracle is also good · the whole has been foreseen and fore-ordained by God from all eternity, as the means for carrying out the purposes of creation

34 *Testimony untrustworthy* — Secondly, it is objected that testimony is untrustworthy, so that we can never be sure that events happened in past times as related Experience often shows us both

that testimony is false and that miracles do not happen Every religion professes to be founded in miracles, and men are apt to believe in miracles without ground.

This objector will scarcely maintain that we can never be certain regarding the occurrence of events separated from us by distance of time To profess to feel prudent doubt whether an English King named Charles was beheaded in Whitehall, or a Roman Emperor named Julius stabbed in the Senate House would be the mere bravado of scepticism, yet no one who does not make this profession can deny that historical events may be known with certainty· much else may be uncertain, but some occurrences cannot reasonably be called in question The objection, therefore, proceeds on a tacit supposition that miraculous narratives are more difficult of proof than others But this supposition confounds two things: the facts, and their miraculous character Julius Cæsar was slain on the 15th of March in a certain year, as history tells us with certainty History also tells us that he was living on the 1st of that same month of March, for his contemporaries saw, heard, and felt him on that day, and their experience has been transmitted to us with certainty Supposing that they had had the same experience on the last day of the month, this experience would have taught them that Julius was alive on that day, and there is nothing to prevent the transmission to us of their later experiences by the same channels as told us of the events of the first day. That the restoration to life after the 15th would have been

miraculous does not affect the possibility of our knowing that his contemporaries perceived him to be dead on one day, and to be alive on a subsequent day. History does not precisely record a miracle, but only records the sensible facts from which we conclude that a miracle was worked We admit that testimony is sometimes false, and that miracles are opposed to general experience but to say that they are opposed to universal experience is gratuitously to assume the point at issue; and to deny that testimony may sometimes be recognized as truthful is not the part of a reasonable man. That all religions profess to be founded on miracles merely shows the general conviction of mankind that miracles are possible, but we deny that any instance can be produced in which a proved miracle is opposed to the Christian Revelation, some apparent examples to the contrary will be discussed immediately The proneness of men to see miracles can hardly have originated, except in some undoubted examples coming before them, and at most it merely shows the need of the greatest caution in examining the testimony before a miracle is admitted

35 *Miraculous character doubtful.*—The third class of objections rests on the alleged impossibility of telling whether a given occurrence is beyond the powers of nature. there may be mere coincidence, or fraud, or some unknown properties of matter and of the human frame may have had a part in producing the effect observed Occurrences may seem miraculous to the ignorant which a wider acquaint-

ance with nature will show to be subject to fixed law.

To take the last point first, we admit that circumstances may occur in which savages could not prudently refuse to admit the claim of a stranger who came to them professing to be a messenger from God, and exhibiting in proof of his claim a power which they could not be blamed for regarding as imperative upon them, whereas in truth it was a natural power which his superior knowledge enabled him to wield. There are stories told of this sort, where an eclipse has been foretold and coming to pass has led the ignorant people to ascribe to some superhuman enlightenment what is really nothing but the exhibition of elementary knowledge of astronomy. In these cases, the assent of the savages is given blamelessly, although it could be withheld; they will never be constrained to believe falsehood; just as in the possible case of wonders being wrought by evil spirits, as we shall explain presently.

The suggestion of coincidence may be put aside, in such a case as we chose for our illustration. It is not so frequent an occurrence that men blind from birth suddenly gain the use of sight, that we can call it a mere coincidence if this happens at the instance when the word of a religious preacher falls upon their ear, and no suspicion of fraud can attach when the man has been long known to have been blind, and the occurrence takes place in the presence of watchful and powerful enemies of the preacher. Nor, lastly, can it be suggested with any plausibility that the words spoken had a natural

power of restoring the wasted eye-balls In this case at least there can be no doubt that the occurrence is superhuman.

36 *Demonic Agency.* — The three groups of objections which we have been discussing are those which have chiefly prevailed in modern times they may be called respectively the Pantheistic, the Deistic, and the Materialistic objection—a Deist being understood, according to English usage, to be one who fully admits the being of God, but denies the existence of Revelation We now come to discuss the Demonic objection, which is scarcely heard of at the present day, except sometimes when it is brought up ironically, and as it were *ad hominem* against the Christians, but which in former times was the ground ordinarily alleged for neglecting the evidence of miracles, both by Jews (St Matt. ix 34, and many other passages of the Gospels), and by heathen persecutors, as in the case of St. Januarius (Bolland *Acta Sanctorum*, t. 6, Sept. 873), and by heretics (Victor, *De Persecutione Vandalorum*, 2, 17, *P.L.* 58, 217) The point of the difficulty is that since evil spirits have power to move matter and work wonders out of the ordinary course of nature, it is impossible to tell the source of any marvel that we meet with, or to know whose utterance it accredits Moreover, it is said that miracles have been wrought by heretics, and therefore do not attest any one form of Christianity, but various forms; they therefore attest error.

Certainly, no Christian can deny the action of evil spirits in the world, for it is clearly taught in

Scripture (Exodus vii. 22; Acts xvi 16, &c), as will be shown fully in its proper place. also, the story of a Novatian Bishop having in the year 419 worked a miracle is related by Socrates (*Hist Eccles* 7, 17; *P G.* 67, 771), and cures are believed to have been wrought at the tomb of the Jansenist Abbé Paris, who died in 1727. But the defender of the Christian miracles as exclusively trustworthy, remarks that neither heathen nor heretic has succeeded in establishing a religion on the basis of miracles, which shows that there was always something about the marvels in question which distinguished them from Divine miracles, and that this is in accordance with what might be expected upon Christian principles, for God cannot consistently with His Holiness permit men to be invincibly led to believe that what is in fact error is the teaching of God addressed to them (See Exodus vii. 12.) Further, it is part of the Christian dispensation that the motives leading to belief should not be such as to compel assent, but only such as render refusal to believe evidently wrong, and Christ Himself declared that there should arise false prophets working great wonders (St Matt. xxiv 24), so that if nothing of the sort happened we should have to contend with a serious difficulty, for a prophecy uttered by Christ would be falsified As to miracles of heretics, those ascribed to Paris by no means abide the application of the tests by which true miracles are distinguished, and which are enumerated in our next paragraph, and we need have no difficulty in admitting the truth of the

relation in Socrates, although it is hard to avoid the suspicion of trickery. According to the story, a scoundrel of a Jew (*Ἰουδαῖός τις ἀπατεών*) made his living by pretending to become a Christian, and being baptized. He took in the Arians and Macedonians, and then offered himself to the Novatians, asking Baptism at the hands of Paul, the Bishop of the sect at Constantinople. Paul prescribed a course of instruction and fasting, which quickened the catechumen's desire for the Sacrament Paul yielded, and all was made ready for the ceremony, when the water disappeared unaccountably, with the result that the fraud of the Jew became known. Thus we see that the miracle, supposing it to have been one, was wrought by God in defence of the sanctity of holy Baptism, that is, of truth, and not of Novatian error. The New Testament plainly recognizes that the gift of miracles is not confined to saints (St. Matt. vii 22, 1 Cor xiii 2), and St Jerome teaches that miracles are wrought by God in view of the merits of Christ, and not of the man who is said to work them. (Comment. in loc *St Matt.*, *P.L.* 26, 49) This doctrine is the basis of the teaching of St Thomas (2. 2 q. 178 a 2)

37. *Criteria of Miracles*—It is worth while to set down the points insisted on by Pope Benedict XIV. as necessary to be attended to, before the cure of a disease can be admitted to have been miraculous: they will be found in the eighth chapter of the fourth Book of the great work *De Canonizatione*. First, the disease must be incurable, or at least difficult of cure: then it must not have reached a

stage when natural cure is possibly imminent: thirdly, no treatment must have been used to which the cure can be ascribed: the cure must be sudden and instantaneous. it must be perfect it must not have been attended with any such bodily change as might be a natural cause of the cure and lastly, the disease must not recur. We may remark that Pope Benedict seems to have been quite alive to the nature of what in our own day have received the name of "faith-cures," when the mere expectation of a cure seems to suffice to fulfil itself He quotes (n 29) with approval a writer who says that he has known many cases where a disease has disappeared on the approach of a Religious or the application of a relic, but has subsequently returned with greater violence than ever. Such cures, of course, are not miracles, or at least cannot be known as miracles Paley (*Evidences of Christianity*) successfully applies Benedict's criteria to discredit the miracles said to have been wrought at the tomb of the Abbé Paris but the learned Archdeacon seems not to have been aware that this supposed wonder-worker was a heretic. Occurrences are met with which have some semblance of being miraculous, but it will generally be found that they totally fail to answer these conditions, in which case, whatever may be their real character, we cannot feel confident that there has been an extraordinary exercise of the Divine power.

38 *Have Miracles ceased?*—The attempt is sometimes made to throw doubt on all relations of miracles by the remark that nothing of the kind

occurs at the present day The reply is that the whole matter is in the hand of God, and that we cannot pretend always to see why He is pleased to act in a particular way at a particular time, nevertheless, if the fact were as stated, we might conjecture that a mode of accrediting a revelation which was suitable when that revelation was first made may become unsuitable under different circumstances, it is not in accordance with God's providence to force men's consents, and the disposition which leads them to refuse acceptance to the well-attested miracles of the old time would enable them to evade the force of miracles at the present day. that the existence of the Christian Church, though of a different order, is more persuasive than any physical miracle (see n. 68), and that the assertion is true only so far as relates to miracles publicly performed in great cities, like Jerusalem and Rome, for miracles have never ceased to be wrought, and still continue, in accordance with the promise of Christ (St Mark xvi 17, 18) This point will be mentioned again when we speak of the Holiness of the Church. (nn. 235, 255) At present, it is enough to refer to M Lasserre's books upon Lourdes

39 *Recapitulation.*—In this chapter, we have discussed four classes of objection to miracles, have pointed out some criteria of assured miracles, and explained how far it is true that public miracles do not happen now with the same abundance as in former times.

CHAPTER IV.

THE CHRISTIAN EVIDENCES—PHYSICAL MIRACLES.

40 *Subject of the Chapter.*—Having shown the futility of the grounds that are sometimes alleged as proving the impossibility of miracles, we may hope that the reasons which we shall now proceed to give for believing that they have actually occurred will be received without prejudice. We shall maintain in successive chapters that the Divine Mission of Christ is attested by miracles of the physical order, by the fulfilment of ancient prophecies and by moral miracles, some of which are going on at the present day before our eyes: from which it will follow that His words are to be received as the words of God, and that the work of Theology is to ascertain and explain His teaching and that of those who teach in His Name and with His authority.

In the two preceding chapters we were forced to assume that the reader admitted the Being and Attributes of God, which will be proved hereafter. In the argument of this and the following chapters no such assumption is necessary, for we shall be concerned with purely historical questions, and shall use the ordinary historical arguments, founded

on documents, tradition, monuments, and institutions We shall have nothing to do with any question whether the documents are of merely human origin, or whether they are of a different nature from other histories All that will come in its place hereafter (Treatise III)

41 *Early Existence of the Church Pliny* —Before entering on our main subject it is well to point out that the existence of the Christian Church and of the mass of truths and moral precepts of which this Church is the depository and guardian, is altogether beyond dispute This is a phenomenon which calls for some adequate explanation, but none such is forthcoming except that which alleges the miracles of Christ The need of explanation is felt more pressingly when it is remembered how very short a time elapsed after the death of Christ before His religion had become the profession of a well-known organized body This is not known from Christian sources alone, but can be proved from certain passages in heathen writers For instance, the younger Pliny found Christians existing in great numbers in his province of Bithynia It was about the year 112 that he wrote a letter to the Emperor Trajan, explaining the difficulty he felt in dealing with the cases of Christians who were brought before him, and he received an answer from the Emperor. These letters are numbered 96 and 97 in some editions of the correspondence, in other editions they are 97 and 98 The whole is most interesting, and well repays careful study. What concerns us is to observe that in this remote

province there existed a community of Christians, numerous and organized. Pliny is familiar with the name, and assumes that the Emperor is equally familiar He notices the Christian practice of assembling on a particular day for religious worship, when the people sang a hymn to Christ as God, and bound themselves by a sacred sanction not to be guilty of theft or other sins, after which they parted, to meet again and share in a meal of ordinary food. They had among them female officials whom he calls Ministræ—deaconesses—whom he tortured without eliciting anything He consults the Emperor as to the course to be adopted, because he had never been present at trials of Christians, showing us that he knew of such prosecutions being in use, and the matter seems to him to be of grave importance on account of the great number of those concerned The contagion of the superstition prevailed not in the cities alone, but had penetrated to the villages and the open country · the temples were deserted, the regular sacrifices discontinued · there was no inducement to breed beasts to be sold as victims There were some who avowed that they had been Christians for twenty years. and all astonished the enlightened Pagan by declaring that there was no evil in their religious practices, and by the constancy with which large numbers of them persevered in defiance of torture and death.

This passage certainly proves how widespread was the Christian profession at the very beginning of the second century, we may have to recur to it, as illustrating other points of our subject The

genuineness of the correspondence or at least of this part of it has been disputed, but on insufficient grounds See a dissertation by F Wilde (Leyden, 1889), *De Plinii et Trajani Epistolis mutuis* This author discusses the whole subject, examining all the arguments that have been advanced on either side of the controversy. The phrase that at their meetings, the Christians partook of ordinary food, points at the report that was current which ascribed to them the eating of human flesh This imputation of cannibalism arose doubtless from some indiscreet or malicious disclosure of the doctrine of the Real Presence

42 *Tacitus* —Pliny tells us nothing of the origin of Christianity, but the omission is supplied by a passage from the Annals of his contemporary, Tacitus it is found in the forty-fourth chapter of the fifteenth Book The historian has been giving an account of the great fire that happened at Rome in the year 64, three years after his own birth. and he relates that the Emperor Nero came under suspicion of having purposely caused the conflagration, to avert which suspicion, he tried to throw the blame on certain persons "whom the populace hated for their crimes and called by the name of Christians This name is derived from Christus, Who was punished by the procurator, Pontius Pilatus, during the reign of Tiberius The execrable superstition was suppressed for a time, but broke out again, and overran not Judæa alone, the country of its birth, but Rome itself" He then describes the cruel modes in which death was inflicted,

on a sham charge of incendiarism, and speaks of the "vast multitude" of those that suffered, remarking that the true cause of their death was not the crime of fire-raising, but "hatred of men," leaving it doubtful whether he means that the Christians hated mankind, or that mankind hated the Christians. The former meaning seems most probable, and it may be noticed that Tacitus, who perhaps was never brought in contact with Christians, speaks of them in harsher terms than Pliny, who had personally examined large numbers of them. At present, however, we are not concerned with the morals of the Christians, but with the proofs of the early prevalence of the religion.

The principal point to observe is that Tacitus speaks undoubtingly of the Christian religion as having originated in Judæa while Pontius Pilate was procurator there, and Tiberius Emperor, that is to say, somewhere between the years 25 and 34, the Founder came under the ban of the Roman law, and nevertheless within a space of between thirty and forty years, the religion had so spread as to count an immense number of followers in the city, and the historian tells all this without hesitation or doubt, showing that it was the story which was current in the mouths of men with whom he himself mixed, on whom the great conflagration had made a deep impression. This rapid spread of a religion, in spite of Government power and mob prejudice, requires explanation.

43 *The Christian and other accounts.*—Christians are prepared with an account which is, it will be

admitted, a perfectly sufficient explanation, if only its historical character is established a task to which we shall now address ourselves Many other explanations have been suggested from time to time, which have had some vogue for a while and then have been laid aside as insufficient Another place will be found for such account of these attempts as is necessary for our purpose (See n 68) At present it is enough to notice that the Christian story as to the origin of the Christian religion stands alone in having been received by millions of men throughout a long succession of centuries

44 *Acknowledged Christian writings* —There has been and is considerable controversy about the date to which the earliest Christian writings are to be ascribed. But there are some which are acknowledged by writers the least inclined to admit that a revelation has been given. scarcely any writer of the least credit at the present day doubts that the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians and two to the Corinthians were actually written by a man named Paul, and were addressed to communities of Christians who had been recently converted by his preaching, or whom he proposed shortly to visit (1 Cor i 12—17, 2 Cor x 14, Galat iv 11, Romans xv 22—24) The authenticity of these four Epistles is admitted practically by every writer, as is attested by Davidson (*Introduction to New Testament*, vol i pp 41, 62, 85, 116 Edit 1882), who can be fully trusted on such a point, and who gives copious references to ancient authorities which leave no room for doubt upon the matter

These four Letters contain much that is difficult to understand, even in regard to history, and still more on matters of doctrine One chief reason of the difficulty is this: a person writing a letter always has in his mind the particular circumstances of his correspondent, and remembers what has occurred during their previous intercourse; he is apt therefore to use expressions and to make allusions which will be readily understood by those for whose reading the piece is primarily intended, but will be obscure and in danger of being totally misunderstood by others who know no more than they can gather from the writing before them. On the other hand, letters of this kind are peculiarly trustworthy as often as the stranger can gather what is the posture of affairs which the writer assumes to be familiarly known there is little risk of being deceived, for it would be beyond the skill of the most skilful forger to insert references of this kind without detection We may therefore feel confidence that we are correctly informed as to such parts of the career of St Paul as are referred to in these four Letters, and that the substance of his preaching actually was such as we there find.

Now, it is impossible to read these Epistles without seeing that the writer preached a religion, the Founder of which was Jesus Christ (1 Cor III. 11), Who was crucified (1 Cor 1 23), and Whom God raised from the dead. (Romans 1. 4) In the fifteenth chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians he sketches the main features of his preaching, expressly saying that Christ died and was buried, and rose

again on the third day and was seen by large numbers of persons, especially by the Apostles (vv. 1—7) His preaching, he says, is vain if Christ rise not (v 14), and he even claims to have himself seen the risen Christ (v 8, and 1 Cor. ix. 1), and to have received instructions direct from Him. (Galat i. 12) The references on these points, as well as on some that follow, might be multiplied almost indefinitely, as will be plain to any reader of the Epistles we merely give a few to indicate the kind of evidence on which we insist

Further, we learn that the writer of these Letters was a man of conspicuous ability, as their whole structure shows He had formerly been a Jew, and most zealous in that religion, his zeal leading him to take an active part in persecuting the Church of Christ (Galat i 13), at present, instead of persecuting, he was persecuted, leading a life of hardship and danger (2 Cor xi 23—27), and incessantly harassed by the cares involved in the work he had undertaken (2 Cor xi 28) He made this boast unwillingly, it was forced from him by the necessity of asserting his authority against some who were inclined to dispute it (2 Cor xi 21) Such a boast would have ruined the boaster, had not the facts to which he appealed been acknowledged by all. From all this it follows that it is impossible to dispute his sincerity when he declared that he held a commission from One Who had been dead and Who rose again from the dead

What were the grounds of his conviction? We have seen that he declares himself to have received

his commission direct from Christ, or that he had seen his Master living. but as it does not appear from these Epistles that he had previously seen Him dead, we cannot show that he had personal knowledge of the fact of the resurrection from the dead on which he laid such stress But he was contemporary of some who had this personal knowledge (1 Cor xv. 6), and of some whom he calls "great" Apostles (2 Cor xi. 5), who were regarded by some as being entitled to the name of Apostles in a higher sense than that in which St Paul could claim it, and who, as he acknowledges, were Apostles before him (Galat i 17), and there is no trace of his holding any doctrine as to the Resurrection different from that of the rest of Christians St Paul had therefore the opportunity of inquiring into the grounds on which this fundamental belief was held, and unless he was unwise beyond the possibility of human unwisdom, he must have used his opportunities, and satisfied himself that some of those around him had seen the Lord dead and had afterwards seen Him alive Thus the reality of the great basic miracle of the Resurrection of Christ can be proved from those four of the Epistles which are recognized on all hands as genuine

45 *The Four Gospels* —These four Epistles are not rejected by any opponent of whom we need take account, but the same cannot be said of some others of what Christians maintain to be among the earliest documents relating to their religion, especially it cannot be said of those four sketches of parts of the life and teaching of Christ which

we call the Gospels. But in spite of opposition we maintain that it can be proved with absolute certainty that these Gospels were written by persons who were contemporary with the events that they record, and who had full opportunities of ascertaining the truth of what they related, and who were not guilty of wilful deception If these points be made out, the historic truth of the Gospel history follows, and this contains a number of undeniably miraculous events by which the authority of Christ as a Divine messenger is attested.

46 *Gospel Miracles.*—It will not be seriously denied that the writers of the Gospels ascribe to Christ the doing of some works that are above the power of nature Thus, such cures as that of the Centurion's servant (St Matt viii. 5—13, St Luke vii 1—10), and of the Ruler's son (St John iv 46—54), admit of no natural explanation, it being remarked that the sick person was at a distance, so that confident expectation could have had nothing to do with the result, the multiplication of loaves and fishes, on two occasions, one related by all the Evangelists (St Matt xiv 14—21, St Mark vi. 34—44, St Luke ix 12—17, St John vi 1—13), the other by St. Matthew (xv 32—38) and St. Mark (viii. 1—8), and the calming the tempest (St Matt viii 23—27, St Mark iv. 37—40, St Luke viii 22—25), certainly surpassed all natural power, still more is the same true of the restoration to life of the young man at Naim (St Luke vii 11—17), where the suggestion of fraud is now rejected by all critics, as inconsistent with the whole life of the

Worker of the miracle; and of Lazarus (St. John xi. 1—53), where we see that the wonder was accomplished under the eyes of unfriendly critics, as was very specially the case also in the instance of the miracle of the man born blind (St John ix 1—34), and the great miracle of all, the Resurrection of Christ, is eminently of the same character. It is attested in the closing chapters of all the Gospels

47. *Miracles as Credentials* —It is hardly necessary to quote passages to show that these wonderful works were regarded by the people who saw them, and by the writers of the Gospels, as proofs of the Divine Mission of Christ This is seen in the narrative in St Matt xvi. 1, St Mark viii 11, and St. Luke xi. 16, where it seemed that a sign "from Heaven" was supposed to be beyond the power of evil spirits we gather it also from St. Matt. xxi 15, St. John vii. 3—5, and St John ix. 31, and in St. John v 36, the Worker expressly appeals to His works as His credentials It remains to show that the Gospel history is trustworthy.

48 *The Gospels when written.*—We shall divide the proof into two parts that the Gospels are the work of persons who lived at or about the time of the rise of the Christian religion, so that they professed to be recording events of their own time, and that these writers had and used the means of knowing the truth of these events and wrote according to their knowledge

The authenticity of a work which purports to contain contemporary history may be gathered

from the judgment formed upon the matter by the generation which immediately succeeded that in which the work professes to be written, or even from the judgment of still later times, if the matter was sufficiently important in their eyes to assure us that they used the means that they possessed of ascertaining the truth We shall apply this test to the case of the four Gospels by showing that within a few years after the events recorded, they were held in unique honour as containing trustworthy records of the life of Christ, in a sense which was not true of any other books. We shall show this by considering the multiplication of manuscripts, the production of versions, and the direct testimonies that are still accessible.

It will be observed that we do not here undertake to show that the Gospels were written by the persons whose names they bear, for in no case is the name of the author a part of the book, the names of the writers are known from other sources, but the Gospels themselves are anonymous, except so far as St. John indicates his own authorship in the last verse but one of his Gospel. (See Cornely, *Introductio*, 3, 226) It is enough for us to prove that the writers, whatever their names, were contemporaries.

Also, we do not here claim for the Gospels an authority of a higher nature than that which belongs to other human histories. The proof of their inspiration will be given later (Treatise III)

49 *Manuscripts*—The earliest extant manuscripts of the Gospels belong to the beginning of

the fifth century, or perhaps to the end of the fourth, but from that time forward they exist in great numbers These manuscripts are far from being identically alike; they exhibit a multitude of discrepancies, not such as to raise any doubt of the general integrity of the documents that they transmit to us, but such as to exclude the idea that they all rest upon one original of no great antiquity. The study of the various readings leads to the conclusion that the documents had been repeatedly transcribed long before the end of the fourth century, so that different "families" of manuscripts are distinguished, the common ancestor of each family being far more ancient than anything that now exists, while the progenitor from which all the families spring cannot be younger than the times of the Apostles This argument proves not merely the antiquity of the Canonical Gospels, but also the peculiar esteem in which they were held. The transcribers, it is true, were careless, and by their errors gave rise to the bulk of the various readings which crowd the pages of critical editions, and sometimes they altered the text before them in accordance with their notions of what it ought to contain, nevertheless, it is clear that they would not have been at the trouble of making the transcript at all, had there not been a demand for copies, and it is to be observed that nothing of the kind can be asserted of any of the other narratives of the life and teaching of Christ which are extant, and pass under the name of Apocryphal Gospels there is no evidence that these ever had a wide

circulation comparable to that of the Four Beyond the contents of the four Gospels, the Christian community preserved very few traditions concerning their Founder A very few sayings and historical particulars have been preserved to us, which have the appearance of being ancient. they will be found collected in Appendix C to Dr Westcott's *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, p 457. Also, the case of the Gospels may profitably be contrasted with that of the most famous classical authors. particulars will be seen in Mr. Gow's *Companion to School Classics*, pp 36, seq., where we read that our knowledge of the writings of Æschylus, Lysias, Plato, and Lucretius, and of large portions of Cicero and Tacitus, is due to single manuscripts of a date long subsequent to the author, yet no serious doubt is entertained that these writings are genuine. (See n 130)

50 *Versions*—The manuscripts of which we are speaking are in Greek, the language in which far the greater part, if not the whole, of the New Testament was written, and through which the whole has come to us But the Gospels were very soon translated into Syriac and into Latin, both versions being in existence in the early part of the second century· and what has been said of the wide spread of the originals applies also to these translations Thus at latest in the third generation after the date of the events recorded, the Gospels were accessible and accepted throughout the Roman Empire and through a great part of the Persian: that is to say, in all parts of the civilized world.

51 *Testimonies*—It remains to speak of the express testimonies that remain to us, showing that predominant authority was early ascribed to the four Gospels The full treatment of this subject is far too long for our limits, it will be found in Father Cornely's *Introductio*, or more completely in Dr. Salmon's *Introduction*. We can do no more than quote a few passages of writers who lived in the second century Clement of Alexandria, who ceased to be head of the Catechetical School of that city in the year 202, was contending with a heretic who quoted what purported to be a passage from the Gospel, but Clement rejects it, saying (*Strom* 3, 13, *P G.* 8, 1193). "This passage is not found in the four Gospels that we have received, but in the Gospel of the Egyptians" We see there that Clement clearly distinguished between the traditional four Gospels and other narratives

Tertullian, who began to write before the end of the second century, more than once gives the names of the four Evangelists, as we know them. (*Advers Marcion*, 4, 2, and 5, *P.L.* 2, 363 and 368)

St Irenæus, who was probably born in 130, cites the same four familiar names (*Adv. Hæreses*, 3, 7, *P.G.* 7, 884.) The weight to be attached to these three testimonies will be seen to be the greater when it is remembered that they represent the belief of parts of the Christian world most remote one from another Clement belonging to Egypt, Tertullian to Carthage, while St. Irenæus was born in Asia Minor, and at the time of writing was Bishop

of Lyons, thus witnessing for Gaul as well as his native country.

Next, we may cite the fragment preserved in the Ambrosian Library at Milan, and which goes by the name of the scholar Muratori, by whom it was first published Its date, it is believed, cannot be later than 170, and it plainly recognizes the four Gospels, as may be seen in Salmon, p 64 n, or in Migne (*P L* 3, 173) It seems to have been written at Rome

St Justin, who presented his *Apology* in the year 150, makes constant use of our Gospels How slender are the grounds on which this is disputed may be seen in Cornely, *Introductio*, 3, 222

Tatian, who was born not far from the year 120, composed a Life of Christ, which was called *Diatessaron* This word means "by four," and it was natural to suppose that it signified a work the materials of which were drawn from the four Evangelists This explanation, however, was contested, and it was maintained that the word was a musical term, and denoted a full or perfect harmony. Recent discoveries, however, have set the question at rest, and a somewhat long but perfectly sure train of reasoning proves Tatian to be a witness that in his time our four Gospels were recognized as possessing paramount authority The particulars of the argument may be read in Salmon, *Introduction*, pp 95—104, in Mr Maher's tract on the subject, and elsewhere Space does not allow us to give them here, nor can we do more than mention Papias, whose remains are collected in the

first volume of Routh's *Reliquiæ Sacræ*, and have important bearing upon the point before us, but give rise to many questions.

52. *Credibility*.—It being taken as established that our four Gospels are the works of contemporaries, it remains to consider whether the writers had the means of knowing the truth as to the matters they describe, and whether they can be trusted to have written according to their knowledge. The miracles in question were sensible facts, and in their own nature capable of being known, and one of the writers professes to have been an eye-witness (St John xix 35, xxi. 24), and as to all of them, if we are satisfied of their veracity, we must suppose that they did not write without having assured themselves of the truth of their narration That they meant to tell the truth follows from this, that they had no inducement to propagate the Christian religion except on the supposition that they were persuaded of its Divine claim upon them In proving that the early preachers embraced a life of toil and hardship, we are somewhat hampered, because we must draw our materials from the four Gospels, the four Epistles of St Paul, and two heathen writers we cannot use the Book of the Acts of the Apostles, the authenticity of which we have not yet proved, and the discussion of which would lead us to a long and needless historical inquiry. But we learn from Tacitus that Christ was crucified, and His followers are not likely to have met with better treatment, nor indeed would they have reported the apparent failure of the

Mission of Christ, had not truth compelled them They report His prophecies, by which He warned them that those who undertook to carry on His work might look forward to scourging and death as their fate (St Matt. x 17; St. John xvi 2), if these prophecies had not been fulfilled in the persons of the writers, they would have discredited their cause by reporting them. And we have direct testimony that these prophecies were fulfilled, not only in the passage of Tacitus already cited (n 38), but in the description which St Paul gives of his life (2 Cor. xi 23—33), where he does not deny that other preachers of Christ, those whom he speaks of in verse 13 as false apostles, suffered similar hardships, but only asserts that his own sufferings exceeded those of the rest This record of what he endured in the performance of the work to which he devoted himself abundantly justifies him in saying (1 Cor. xv 19)· "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable"

53 *Objections.*—Such is then a very brief outline of the proof that Christ wrought physical miracles in attestation of His claim to be received as a Divine Messenger, from which it follows that we must look to His utterances as containing revelations from God. The sketch is most imperfect, the full development requiring much space, as is the case with all historical arguments. its full treatment must be sought elsewhere

The question of the date of the Gospels being of vital importance to the opponents of the Christian

Revelation, they leave no stone unturned in their endeavour to find objections to bring against our position. They elude some of the early testimony by denying that it applies to our Gospels, and by inventing certain primitive Gospels, which they say were once in esteem, but which for no assignable reason perished, making way to allow the present Gospels to take their place. to which theory it is enough to say that it has no producible basis. But they rest chiefly upon internal evidence, and point out what seem to be contradictions in the Gospels as indicating fiction; at the present stage of our argument we need say no more than that general agreement with minute discrepancies is the ordinary condition of historical narratives. the full discussion of the bearing of these alleged contradictions will find its proper place when we speak of the inspira tion of Scripture. (n 139) Also, they assume to know what the true Evangelist would have said or not have said under the particular circumstances in which he was placed; a presumptuous pretension· and it is with them a fundamental position that every narrative involving a supernatural element cannot possibly be authentic, for miracles never happen a position which, if proved, would render all further inquiry useless, but which never can be proved, as we tried to show in the last chapter

54 *Recapitulation* —In this chapter, after pointing out that the early existence of Christianity is an undeniable fact which imperatively calls for explanation, we showed that the Christian explanation is sufficient, and that this account was based upon

certain physical miracles alleged to have been wrought by the Founder, these miracles are assumed to be familiar by St Paul in four of his Letters, as to the genuineness of which there is no controversy; and the particulars of many are detailed in the four Gospels, which were received as authentic in the earliest times.

CHAPTER V.

PROPHECY.

55 *Subject of the Chapter.*—In this chapter we shall discuss some of the Messianic prophecies found in the Old Testament, and point out the conclusive proof which they afford of the Divinity of the Christian Revelation, in spite of all the criticism to which they have been subjected

56 *Nature of the Argument.*—The incapacity of man to see into the distant future with any approach to precision is one of the commonplaces of moralists Even in a physical matter, such as the weather, the forecasts for merely a single day are vague, and are often falsified by the event, and where the action of free-will comes in, the most far-sighted statesman will not pretend to say what will be the state of public affairs a month hence, much less to foretell the actions of individuals, which are always less reducible to rule than those of masses of men. If, then, we find a case where a detailed prophecy has been committed to writing, and has received its fulfilment after the lapse of a century, we must admit that it is the effect of some power above nature: and the same tests that we mentioned in regard to miracles (n. 32) will guide us in judging

whether or not this power is Divine We shall show in this chapter that prophecies answering to these requirements have attested the Christian Revelation, whence it follows that this Revelation is Divine.

In addition to what we have already proved, we shall assume, what is not called in question, that the writings of the Old Testament existed some time before the rise of Christianity

57 *Vague expectations.*—The subject may be introduced by remarking that about the time of the rise of Christianity, expectation ran high throughout the world that some great change was impending, and men's thoughts were turned to the Jewish nation as destined to produce some great man who would change the course of public events We read this expressly in Tacitus, who was a boy at the time in question and may be said to speak from his own knowledge Writing of the year 70, he says (*Histories*, 5, 13) "There was a widespread persuasion that according to the ancient books of the priests the time had come when the East should regain its strength and those should come forth from Judæa that should master the world" The expressions of Suetonius, also a contemporary, are still stronger (*Vesp.* 4) · "A steady conviction had long been rife in the East that at this very time those should come forth from Judæa who were destined to master the world" Josephus the Jew testifies that this prophecy was found in the sacred writings of his nation (*Wars of the Jews*, 6, 5, 4); and he probably had this passage in his mind when he saluted Vespasian as destined to be Emperor, and thereby gained

release from his bonds and the favour of the great man. (*Wars*, 3, 8, 9, and 3, 10, 7.)

At the very time of which these authors speak, the prophecy in question was receiving its fulfilment a power had lately gone forth from Judæa and was mastering the world. this power was the Christian religion

58. *Daniel.*—The vague expectations of which we have been speaking were not without a written basis. Whatever difference of opinion there may be as to the date when the Book of the Prophet Daniel was put into its present shape, no critics doubt that it was in existence substantially in the shape in which we now have it at least a century and a half before the Christian era We believe that its true date is still earlier, by two hundred and fifty years, but the later date is sufficient for our purpose, and we wish for brevity's sake to avoid all historical or critical controversy, as far as possible. Now there was nothing in the situation of the Jewish people in the middle of the second century before Christ, to suggest that in any sense they were destined ever to become masters of the world, while to fix a time when the process should begin, not immediately, but after five or six generations should have passed away, was certainly a work surpassing all the possibilities of human sagacity. The history of the Jewish nation at the period in question is known in outline with perfect certainty they had successfully resisted the Greek King Antiochus, who endeavoured to force them to abandon their ancestral religion and peculiar customs, and they had been admitted

to an alliance of nominal equality and real dependence with Rome itself, as may be read in the eighth chapter of the First Book of Machabees, but although strong in their inflexibility, they had shown no signs of aggressive power, or inclination to attack their neighbours, nor had they any apostolic spirit inducing them to bring over converts to their religion, such proselytes were received if they offered themselves, but there was no activity in seeking to attract them on spiritual grounds social and commercial considerations sometimes induced heathens to submit to circumcision, but such men were in no great esteem there were many more who attended the Synagogue worship and professed to observe some parts of the moral law as it was understood by the Jews, but the bond attaching these "proselytes of the gate" to the nation was of the loosest description the circumcised "proselytes of righteousness" were fully incorporated

Now let the ninth chapter of the Book of Daniel be read, and it will be seen that in the midst of much that is obscure, it is clear that a revelation is described which "the man Gabriel," a Divine messenger, is represented as giving to the Prophet, in answer to his prayer and according to this revelation, "Christ the Prince" would come after the lapse of a certain space of time from the going forth of the edict to build up Jerusalem again · and few critics are found to question the common belief that this space of time is expressed by weeks of years, and amounts to something less than five

centuries Further, it cannot be doubted that the "going forth of the edict," whatever it precisely meant, took place about five hundred years before the rise of Christianity, which religion at once began the work of mastering the world, which it accomplished, so far as the Roman Empire was concerned, when after the lapse of three more centuries Constantine gave civil recognition to the new religion. The minute discussion of this famous prophecy belongs to commentators upon the Book of Daniel, and they find considerable difficulty in determining the exact sense of each phrase, and the manner in which it received its accomplishment but their doubts do not extend to more than a few years' difference in the results, and this does not affect the broad view which we have taken, and which is sufficient for our purpose This at least stands out clearly a writer who lived not later than a century and a half before Christ foretold within a few years the date at which a Prince would come Who should be slain, but on Whose death iniquity should be abolished The Founder of Christianity was a Prince Who answered to this description, and came at the destined time He was a Prince, for notwithstanding His death of shame, His followers went forth from Jerusalem and mastered the world We have here a prophecy which plainly surpasses the natural power of man, and no one will suggest that it was diabolic; it remains, therefore, that the prediction was Divine, and that the Prince was in a special sense a messenger from God.

59. *An objection answered.*—Those writers who do not admit the interpretation which we have given of this passage of Daniel, generally explain it as being a "prophecy after the event," and make out that it refers to the defeat of the attempt of Antiochus to destroy the religion and national existence of the Jews But this interpretation is open to the difficulty that the "Christ, the Prince" of the Prophet, is spoken of as a single person, while no one man stood conspicuously forward in the struggle against the Greek tyrant, the Machabean family took the leading part, but there was no one member of the family who took so leading a part as to account for his being spoken of as the Anointed Prince, to the exclusion of the rest Moreover, there is no possibility of making the chronology suit with this explanation, there is no way of making out that seventy weeks was the interval between the appearance of the edict for the rebuilding of the city and the exploits which brought the War of Independence to a glorious termination. This interval cannot have been very different from three hundred and fifty years

The main objection to the Messianic interpretation of the Seventy Weeks is based on the assertion that prophecy is never definite as to times and places But this principle, as we have already pointed out, is of its own nature incapable of proof, for the whole matter depends upon the free-will of God, which man cannot discern, and if the principle means no more than that in fact no such prophecies exist, then it cannot, without a manifest

petitio principii, be adduced as proving that a particular prophecy does not disclose the future in a definite manner In fact, the Scriptures contain many prophecies which Christians assert to be perfectly definite, and to have been exactly fulfilled, the upholders of the principle that we have been speaking of must discuss each of these on its merits, and show that the words do not bear the meaning put upon them In matters of this kind, induction is useless unless it rise to the character of perfect induction, and then it is a truism

60 *Michæas* —We proceed to the discussion of a prophecy which is definite in regard to place It relates to the town of Bethlehem, which lies about six miles south of Jerusalem, in the territory which formerly belonged to the tribe of Juda This town in primitive times had the name of Ephrata, as is recorded in Genesis xxxv 19, xlviii 7, we have no account of the circumstances that led to the change of name There was another Bethlehem in the tribe of Zabulon (Josue xix 15), by way of distinction from which the town near Jerusalem is spoken of as Bethlehem Ephrata, or Bethlehem of Juda It is noticeable that the name is not found in the Hebrew text of the fifteenth chapter of the Book of Josue, where the towns of Juda are enumerated, and the omission has given some trouble to interpreters, the name is found in the Septuagint, after verse 59 In 2 Paral xi 6, it is mentioned among the cities of Juda which Roboam "built," or fortified, and its name occurs in connection with the family of David, who came from there. It still

retains its name, and has a population of some 3,000 Christians

This town of Bethlehem is mentioned in a passage found in the Book of the Prophet Micheas. (v 2) This book was certainly written long before the Birth of Christ, probably as much as seven hundred years The Prophet has been speaking of the events that were destined to come to pass "in the last days," that is to say, at some indefinite future time In the fourth chapter, the Jewish people are told that they shall be carried captive to Babylon, and this specification of place should be observed, but they are to be delivered, and to become strong against their enemies, after which comes the verse that we are to consider "And thou, Bethlehem Ephrata, art a little one among the thousands of Juda, out of thee shall He come forth unto Me that is to be the ruler in Israel, and His going forth is from the beginning, from the days of eternity " that is to say, the petty town of Bethlehem is congratulated on its destiny, that it is to be the birthplace of Him Who is to be the Captain of the people in their triumphant struggle with their enemies, and Who shares the eternity of God

The Gospels of St Matthew and St John afford us proof that this prophecy was understood at the time of the Birth of the Founder of the Christian religion, and that it was fulfilled by His Birth at Bethlehem, to which place His Mother, leaving her home at Nazareth, had journeyed for a temporary purpose We read the circumstances of the Birth

in the first chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel, and in the second chapter, when King Herod asked the chief priests and scribes where Christ should be born, they answered "In Bethlehem of Juda. For so it is written in the Prophet And thou, Bethlehem, the land of Juda, art not the least among the princes of Juda, for out of thee shall come forth the Captain that shall rule My people Israel" And in St. John (vii 42) we find the supposed birth of our Lord in Galilee treated as conclusive against His claim to be considered the Messiah, for, it was asked, Doth not the Scripture say, that Christ cometh "of the seed of David and from Bethlehem, the town where David was?"

That Christ was to be of the seed of David is not declared in the passage of Micheas, the popular and well-founded impression on the subject to which St John testifies, was probably derived from 1 Paral. xvii. 14, and Psalm cxxxi 11

The meaning of the prophecy as to the place of birth is so clear as not to call for explanation In the face of it, the fact that our Lord had His ordinary residence in Nazareth, and was supposed to have been born there, was a real difficulty, but one which a little inquiry would have cleared up, for His Mother was living and accessible (St Matt xii 47, St. John xix 25), and it was probably from her that St. Matthew and St Luke learned the particulars of the visit to Bethlehem that they have recorded (St. Matt ii. 1—12, St Luke ii. 1—20) This instance illustrates what we shall see in the Treatise on Faith (nn. 313, 314), that the motives

leading men to believe in God and His Revelation are sufficient to remove all reasonable doubt, but not so evident as to force the will to a consent which would not be free, and therefore not meritorious (See Denz 1661)

It will be observed that the words of the priests reported in St. Matthew's Gospel are not absolutely identical with the citation from the Prophet The differences between the passages are quite immaterial, but there is no verbal identity Indeed, at first sight there is a contradiction· the Prophet says that Bethlehem is little, and he is cited as saying that Bethlehem is not little, but a moment's thought will show that this contradiction is merely apparent, and that both forms of expression convey the same sense. the petty town of Bethlehem is to be ennobled by the Birth of the Saviour.

The latter part of this prophecy relates to the eternal generation of the Saviour, as will be explained in our Treatise on the Blessed Trinity.

61 *Fulfilments of Prophecy.*—The passage of Micheas which we have been considering appears to relate to Christ in its direct and most literal sense, and to be most properly a prophecy The same cannot be said of two other passages from the Old Testament which are quoted by St Matthew in connection with the visit of the Magi to Bethlehem, and a few remarks upon them will be useful The first is the passage from Osee xi. 1, quoted in St Matt. ii 15, the second, quoted in the 18th verse of the same chapter, is taken from Jerem. xxxi 15

The Prophet Osee, in this chapter, is describing the fortunes of the Israelite nation. When young, and as a child, it was brought forth from the slavery of Egypt by the power of God, and yet in its ingratitude it fell off to idolatry. All this seems to have nothing to do with the sojourn of our Lord in Egypt, and yet St. Matthew tells us that the return from that land of exile was a fulfilment of that prophecy. The apostate Emperor Julian, in the seventh book of his work against the Christians, accused the Evangelist of practising upon the simplicity of his readers, as St Jerome tells us in the third book of his Commentary on Osee (*P L* 25, 195) Eusebius (*Demonstr. Evang.* 9, 4, *P G.* 22, 665) boldly maintains that the prophecy has direct reference to Christ, and perhaps Julian had him in mind as one whom the Evangelist had deceived. But it is better to adopt the view of Jerome (l c.), who holds that the passage primarily relates to the delivery of the Israelites from Egypt under Moses; but it regards this recall of the chosen people from the land of banishment to the land of promise as an acted prophecy of the return of Christ from Egypt to Judæa God can foreshadow the future by events no less than by words, and He is said to use this mode of speaking by *types*, when His providence has so arranged the course of one event as to make it prefigure some future event, which is called the antitype

In the passage from Jeremias quoted by St Matthew, the case seems to be different. If we still follow the interpretation of St Jerome, in his

sixth Book on Jeremias (*P L.* 24, 876), this passage of the Prophet refers exclusively to the circumstances of the captivity of the ten tribes, and the wailing of the mothers whose sons were suffering the penalty of their crimes cannot be a type of what occurred when the Holy Innocents were slaughtered It follows that, according to this great Doctor, the Evangelist merely "accommodated" the words of the Prophet to the matter which he was describing, and did not adduce them as prophetic of the event The case serves to illustrate the meaning of the word "accommodation," even if we hold that the Evangelist adduced the passage as directly applicable. As to this, see the matter discussed in Father Knabenbauer's *Commentary on St Matthew*

These three passages, cited by St Matthew in vv 6, 15, 18, of his second chapter, are specimens of three ways in which the Old Testament is used in the New In the passage of Micheas we have a direct prophecy of the event, and the Gospel calls attention to the fulfilment of this prophecy, in that from Osee, the Prophet refers to a past event, which event was typical, and therefore prophetic of that which the Gospel records, the passage from Jeremias may have been in no sense prophetic, but its words are used by the Evangelist as aptly expressing a matter which was not contemplated by the Prophet, nor if we may use the expression, by the Holy Spirit Who spoke through him. It will be observed that the form of citation is not the same in the 18th as in the 15th verse in the earlier

case we have *ut adimpleretur*—ἵνα πληρώθῃ—"in order that it might be fulfilled," in the latter, *tunc adimpletum est*—τότε ἐπληρώθη—"then was fulfilled" But the question to which class any particular citation is to be referred cannot be settled off-hand by merely observing the words of introduction, but the judgment of interpreters must be exercised upon all the circumstances of the case, and after all there is often room left for doubt Thus, Cornelius à Lapide follows St Jerome in the way he understands the passage from Osee, but differs from him as to that taken from Jeremias

62. *Other Messianic Prophecies.*—There are many other prophecies concerning the Messiah to be found in the Old Testament, some authors collecting as many as a hundred. We can do no more than briefly notice one or two The name of Prot-Evangelium, or Primitive Gospel, is given to the first passage of the kind, in Genesis iii 15, where God promises that there should be enmities between the seed of the woman and the serpent, whose head should finally be crushed, a prophecy which concerns more particularly the Blessed Mother of the Saviour A series of passages record the promises that the Deliverer should be descended from Abraham (Genesis xii. 3), from Isaac (Genesis xxvi 4), and from Jacob (Genesis xxviii 14) The much controverted passage in Genesis xlix 8—12, may perhaps be taken as showing that He should descend from Juda, that son of Jacob on whom his father pronounced this blessing, but it refers more particularly to the time of coming of this Redeemer,

which should take place before national independence was altogether lost to the Jewish people. The same mode of indicating the date is generally thought to be also adopted by the Prophet Aggeus, whose office was to encourage the people who were engaged in erecting a second Temple at Jerusalem, in place of that which had been built by Solomon and destroyed by the Assyrians Some of the elders, who had seen the glory of the Temple of Solomon, lamented that with all their efforts, that which they now were raising fell so short of that which they remembered, and to comfort them, Aggeus, speaking in the name of God, declared (II 7—10) that the time should come when the glory of the later house should be greater than that of the first, and he gives the reason which, according to the Vulgate translation, is that He Whom all nations desire should come to that house These words cannot bear any interpretation except that which refers them to the Messiah, and since this second Temple was destroyed by Titus in A D 70, it follows that He has come long ago. It follows further that the passage avails in Catholic theology as a proof that this coming has now past, for, as will be shown in its proper place (n 152), the authority of the Vulgate is such that no dogmatic error is deducible from its words But it by no means follows that the Vulgate correctly represents what the Prophet wrote, and in the present case there is great difficulty in accepting the version, unless we suppose that the Hebrew text is corrupt In the Hebrew the verb is in the plural, and its subject is a collective, so that the

meaning is "the desirable things shall come," whether it be the things which the nations desire or which they possess; either way the verse would contain an assurance that the treasures of the nations should one day be lavished in adorning this second house; as was in fact done by the hands of Herod the Great, as described by Josephus (*Antiquities*, 15, 11, 3) The same meaning is given by the Greek of the Septuagint· but, nevertheless, the Vulgate interpretation finds defenders. See Corluy (*Spicilegium*, 1, 520), who upholds the Latin, and Knabenbauer (*Prophetæ Minores*, 2, 187—199), who deserts it.

The latter part of the Book of Isaias (xlii —lxvi) is full of descriptions of the rejection of Christ, His sufferings and Death, and many circumstances are alluded to by Zacharias, also the Psalms afford a large number of passages, four at least being entirely Messianic (Psalms ii. xliv lxxi. and cix)

63 *Prophetic Allusions* —In the case of many of these passages the reference to Christ is so clear that it can scarcely be questioned, but there are others where the meaning cannot be demonstrated In the case of these obscurer passages, no fair judgment can be formed concerning the allusion except by those who admit the Messianic interpretation of the clearer texts. Just as was remarked in the case of miracles (n. 32), so with prophecies, there is a family likeness among them, and those who have made acquaintance with some members of the family will easily recognize the rest, only,

care must be taken that specimens of undoubted genuineness are chosen for study

The full force of the argument for the Christian Revelation founded on the prophecies contained in the Old Testament cannot be understood without a discussion of the whole of these passages, to show their orderly sequence Such a discussion will be found in various works devoted to the special subject, but it would carry us far beyond our limits to attempt it

64 *Recapitulation* —In the chapter on Prophecy, after stating the nature of the argument, we quoted Tacitus, Suetonius, and Josephus, to show that at the coming of Christ, a vague expectation existed throughout the world that some power, springing from Judæa would establish itself and rule The origin of this expectation was then traced to the prophecy of Daniel, and Micheas was quoted as declaring that Bethlehem should be the birthplace of the Saviour Various modes of the fulfilment of prophecy were explained, and a large number of Messianic prophecies were briefly indicated.

CHAPTER VI.

THE CHRISTIAN EVIDENCES. MORAL MIRACLES

65 *Subject of the Chapter*.—This chapter deals with the moral miracles that attest the truth of Christianity more persuasively than the physical miracles and the prophecies found in the Scripture. The chapter assumes some of the teachings of history, but there is no need to touch on matters of historical controversy; the broad facts on which all agree are sufficient for our purpose.

66 *Nature of the Argument*.—A moral miracle, as we explained (n. 25), is an event depending upon the free-will of man, but which is inconsistent with the principles that ordinarily regulate human conduct. These moral miracles, when established, have no less probative force than physical miracles and prophecies, and they are peculiarly easy to establish, inasmuch as they concern the action of large bodies of men, which is necessarily notorious. A physical miracle is essentially an isolated occurrence, if it happened frequently, it would necessarily cease to be a probative miracle, and being isolated, it necessarily falls under the immediate cognizance of a few only, and those who know it only by report are less impressed. But a moral miracle can

scarcely be recognized unless it is the act of a multitude, for the act of one or two persons may be set down to freak, illustrating the freedom of the human will. But experience shows that though the units which compose a multitude of men are individually free and capable of freaks yet the conduct of the whole number can ordinarily be foreseen and predicted with a degree of assurance approaching that which is felt in regard to physical phenomena But the actions of communities of men constitute the ordinary matter of the history of nations hence our argument in this chapter will be founded on the broad facts of general history We shall show that under the influence of Christianity masses of men have acted in a way which would not have been adopted by them under the ordinary influences of nature, it follows that the Christian influence was something other than natural, and in fact it was a miracle attesting the Christian Revelation We shall show that the Christian religion spread rapidly in the world without there being any assignable cause for its success, that this spread was in accordance with prophecy, that it took place in spite of the Christian dogma requiring humble submission of intellect to unattractive beliefs, while the Christian moral law exacted the renouncement of much that was dear to man and the adoption of a strange and distasteful line of conduct, that the religion spread, although the civil power was exerted to the utmost to check it, numbers in all ages having suffered torments and death rather than do any act which

was inconsistent with the Christian profession; and lastly, that the success of the religion was secured in spite of the misconduct of many that embraced it.

67. *The Conversion of the Empire*.—The change which came over the Roman Empire in the course of the half-century between 300 and 350 years after the Christian era is perhaps unique and unparalleled in history. The change is foreshadowed, if we compare two verses of the Acts of the Apostles (i. 13 and ii. 14), the Apostles had been living in the privacy of the "upper room," when the Holy Spirit came upon them and the rest, this was the foundation of the Christian Church, and the result is seen when we read that Peter stood up with the eleven and lifted up his voice and spoke to the multitude with such effect that by this one sermon three thousand of the people were converted and baptized. St Augustine tells us how the Cross, which had been the badge of infamy and mark of the deepest scorn, was in his time raised to honour as the Christian symbol, and had its place on the crowns of kings (*Enarr. in Psalm* liv. n. 12, *P.L.* 36, 637). The same point is illustrated by the story, true or false, of the vision of the Cross in the heavens, seen by Constantine when on his successful march to Rome in the year 311, the Cross bearing the inscription, "In this conquer," whether in Latin, *In hoc signo vinces*, or as others report in Greek, Ἐν τούτῳ νίκα. The heavenly promise or injunction thus given was abundantly fulfilled, when Constantine secured to himself the dominion of the whole Roman world and became

the first Christian Emperor A discussion of the evidence for this story will be found in the second of Newman's *Essays on Miracles*, c. v § 4

But perhaps the most famous narrative of this kind is that of the Seven Sleepers of Ephesus The authorities for the story will be found collected in the Bollandist *Acta Sanctorum* for July 27. The Seven Sleepers are mentioned in the Roman Martyrology for that day, but without any particulars, and we are quite at liberty to regard the current version of their story as pure fable, as is done by Cardinal Baronius (*Annal Eccles* ad ann 853, n 61 [84]), but even if false it shows how the conversion of the Empire struck the inventor of the story It tells how seven Christian men fled from Ephesus, to avoid the persecution of the Emperor Decius, about the year 250 They took refuge in a cave, the mouth of which was blocked with stones, by order of the magistrates, and they were left to starve They fell asleep and slept for a century or more Meanwhile a peasant had removed some of the stones, and when the sleepers woke, one of them was able to leave the cave, and make his way to the city, hoping to buy bread His astonishment is described at finding the Cross raised to adorn the city gates at seeing the churches, the use of which he recognized, and at hearing passers-by swear by the name of Christ His sleep had begun while the old pagan world still existed, he awoke at the dawn of Christian civilization

As to the fact of the rapid spread of the Christian religion, one or two quotations will suffice

It might be enough to rest on the letter of Pliny already cited (n 41), from which we learn that in Bithynia at least, a large part of the population was Christian as early as the year 112, and there is no reason to suppose that the circumstances of that province were more favourable to the growth of the new religion than those of the rest of the Empire no Apostle is recorded to have preached there But we get positive testimony from the writings of St Justin Martyr, who was born about 114 In his Dialogue with the Jew Trypho, "the best known Jew of his age," as Eusebius calls him (*Hist* 4, 18 *P.G.* 20, 376), St Justin ventures to taunt his formidable antagonist with the utter failure of the attempt of the priests and teachers of the Jewish nation to put down the Christian religion the upshot of all their efforts was that the name of Jesus was reviled and blasphemed *throughout the world* (Dial. c *Tryph Judæo*, n. 117, *P.G* 6, 748) a sure sign that also it was known and honoured throughout the world little more than a century after the Death of Christ Tertullian, who wrote about the year 200, speaks to the same effect, but more fully. He is addressing the heathen Emperor (*Apolog* c. 37, *P L.* 1, 462) "We are but of yesterday and we fill all that is yours, your cities, your islands your military posts; your boroughs, your council chambers and your camps, your tribes, your corporations, the palace, the senate, the forum your temples alone do we leave to you" And again in his book against the Jews (*Adv Jud.* c. 7; *P L* 2, 610), he testifies that the tribes of Africa, Spain

and Gaul and Britain, Sarmatians, Dacians, Germans and Scythians, all the peoples of the Latin world in short, had admitted Christ to reign He conquered where the Roman arms failed, the bolted gates of cities opened to admit Him. There is no doubt some rhetorical exaggeration in this passage, but at the same time it cannot have been wholly devoid of foundation A controversialist would ruin his cause who spoke thus boastfully and was not known to speak with substantial truthfulness

68. *This Success how accounted for.*—Those writers who do not admit the Divine origin of the Christian Revelation feel the necessity of discovering some natural explanation of its success in subduing Rome; and those who are most familiar with the records of the time are those who are most pressed by the sense of this necessity Gibbon, the historian of the *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, possessed an unsurpassed acquaintance with his subject, and he devotes the fifteenth chapter of his great work to pointing out five causes by which he thinks that the progress of Christianity can be explained without recourse to special Divine intervention We will briefly examine these in order

I. The first cause assigned by Gibbon is the inflexible, intolerant zeal of the Christians It is quite true that the Christians in whose time the conversion of the Empire was wrought were inflexible and intolerant that is to say, they believed the Christian Revelation to be a message from God to men, and intended for the benefit of all men; and they were anxious to extend this benefit as

widely as possible, and to root out all views, principles, and practices which were opposed to this revelation, as being false and injurious But this spirit was as far as possible from that which would recommend the religion to the Romans of the time, whose disposition in religion no less than in philosophy was eclectic, it is well represented by the story told, whether truly or falsely, by the writer of the Life of Alexander Severus, which goes under the name of Lampridius (*Historia Augusta*, p 123 E of the Paris Edition of 1620) This Emperor reigned from 222 to 235, and the historian says, on the authority of a contemporary writer, that he each morning went through his devotions in his private chapel, where he had, amongst others, the images of Apollonius, Christ, Abraham, and Orpheus a strange mixture, for the first-named was a Pythagorean philosopher and wonder-worker of the first Christian century, whose Life, written about the year 200 by Philostratus, seems to have been intended to be a rival of the Gospels, and to help the effort then making to revivify the dying pagan system, while Orpheus was a merely mythological personage What Alexander is said to have done, all Rome might have done, and St Leo truly describes the spirit which prevailed when he says (Serm 4 [82], *in Natali, Apost Petri et Pauli*, n 2, *P L.* 54, 423), that the city which held sway over all nations was itself under the sway of the errors of all, and believed herself most attentive to the claims of religion because there was no falsehood she declined to embrace. This temper far from being conciliated

by the claim of the Christian to the exclusive possession of truth, would be revolted by it: in fact, Pliny tells us in the letter already quoted (n. 41), that in his opinion the obstinacy of the Christians itself deserved punishment

II Gibbon assigns as the second cause of the success of Christianity the doctrine of a future life. No doubt this doctrine tended to make Christians firm in their profession, and in fact the words of Christ, "These shall go into everlasting punishment and the just into life everlasting" (St. Matt. xxv 46), have in all ages been powerful deterrents from evil and supports of virtue, but the question remains, how it happened that this doctrine which had been taught barrenly by the poets and philosophers of paganism suddenly, when preached by Christian missionaries, became the mainspring of the life of large communities The truth is that men did not believe in Christ because He taught the immortality of the soul. but they believed in immortality because Christ taught it.

III The third cause is the miraculous power ascribed to the Apostolic Church This is a real cause of the success of Christian teachers who "going forth preached everywhere, the Lord working withal, and confirming the word with signs that followed" (St Mark xvi. 20) That these wonderful works did as a matter of fact occur was fully admitted even by those who had every opportunity of knowing the truth and who were most concerned to deny them · but the only question raised seems to have concerned the nature of the power to which

they were due, which the pagans set down as magic art, as we saw before (n. 36)

IV. The pure and austere morals of the Christians are assigned as the fourth cause The same remarks are applicable here as we made on the second of Gibbon's causes How did it happen that the Christians adopted so pure and austere a life? In truth, the Christian standard of morality was raised so high above that professed by pagan society that the Divine force of the religion is better seen in nothing than in its success in imposing this standard upon the world. We shall have another opportunity of enlarging upon this point (n 70)

V. The last cause is the union and discipline of the Christian republic. Again we may use the same retort. What natural power secured this unity among men, and induced them to submit to this discipline? Gibbon makes special mention of the wealth which he conceives the Church to have possessed, and of the practice of excommunication. But this wealth must have been derived from the contributions of the Christians, and there is no inducement to join an institution in the fact that the neophyte will be expected to contribute to its support; and to be cut off from the Church can have no terrors except for those who already value the privilege of membership

This attempt of Gibbon to account for the marvel whose existence he recognized, cannot be deemed successful, and what was said by St. Augustine (*De Civit Dei*, 22 5, *P L.* 41, 756) remains true, that if the world were converted without the aid of

miracles, this conversion would be the greatest miracle of all

69 *The Success foretold.*—St Augustine, in his Tract on Faith in the Invisible, has an argument which deserves mention It is found in the fourth chapter, n 7 (*P L.* 40, 176) He urges that the existence of the Christian religion is not only a standing miracle, but a standing fulfilment of prophecy It is no small marvel, he says, that the whole race of man is moved by the name of one crucified Malefactor We see before our eyes the accomplishment of the promise made to Abraham, that in him shall all the kindred of the earth be blessed (Genesis xii 3, and xviii 18.) All the Gentiles have become the inheritance of the Son of God (Psalm ii 8) all the kindreds of the Gentiles adore in His sight (Psalm xxi 28), He that slept has risen from His sleep (Psalm xl 9), and to Him the Gentiles come from the ends of the earth professing the vanity of the idols which their fathers worshipped (Jerem xvi. 19), for the Lord has consumed all the gods of the earth (Sophon ii 11), Christ is exalted above the heavens, and His glory is over all the earth (Psalm cvii 6)

The prophets and psalmists had no natural ground for speaking with such assurance, but the event proved that their assurance was justified

70 *Christian Morality* —The success which attended the efforts of Christian teachers will appear the more inexplicable when the obstacles are considered which stood in their way, and first we will mention the point which we referred to

when discussing the fourth of Gibbon's vaunted Five Causes Each man that embraced Christianity professed his readiness to submit to a moral law which put a restraint upon his natural inclinations, far severer than that which any heathen teacher had succeeded in imposing upon his disciples The bulk of the heathen moralists went no further than to point out the expediency of just dealing, the control of passions and the like, the Stoics took a view which seemed to place morality upon a sounder basis, when they urged that it was right to live according to nature but they failed to produce any motive that availed to induce men to do what was right, and all their exhortations were utterly without effect in moulding the lives of large bodies of men. The utility of observing certain lines of conduct and the abstract beauty of a natural life undisturbed by passion, might have been proclaimed for centuries without producing more effect then they had produced at the time of which we are speaking, Christianity laid down its positive rules, Thou shalt not steal, and the like, and crowds gathered together at the peril of their lives to pledge themselves to observe these rules, as Pliny tells us (n 41) These rules were observed because they were laws laid down by God the Creator, Who had the right to impose them and the will and power to punish their transgression, and their breach would be inconsistent with the love which the same God had won by becoming Man and dying for the redemption of His creatures, but even these motives would have been powerless to produce their

effect had not the grace of the same God worked invisibly in the hearts of men, strengthening them to do that which would have been beyond their natural strength

I To understand something of the effect of the preaching of this law upon mankind, we may contrast the manners of Europe of the third century after Christ with those of the nineteenth. And first, idolatry was once universal and now is unknown, so utterly unknown that men find it hard to believe that such folly and wickedness ever existed, and suspect that Isaias was exaggerating in the picture he draws (xliv 13—17) of the carpenter who uses one and the same piece of wood, part for fuel to cook his pottage and part to make a god and bow down before it and pray to it and say, "Deliver me, for thou art my god" But that actual idolatry really prevailed even among educated men long after the Birth of Christ is proved by the distinct avowal of Arnobius, the African teacher of rhetoric, who being converted from paganism to Christianity not much earlier than the year 300, wrote a brilliant exposure of the follies and contradictions of the popular religion He declares (*Adv. Gentes*, 1, 39, *P L.* 5, 767) that, before his conversion, in his blindness he used to venerate gods fashioned on the anvil with the hammer, and he would speak to a log of wood and beg benefits from it This folly now can scarcely be found in the Western world

II. Christian honour of purity has replaced the foul and public vice which formed a leading and most attractive part of the ceremonial of idol

worship. The heathens honoured their gods by the use of practices which the Apostle will not allow to be named among Christians (Ephes v 3) We read of this in the account of the rites by which the golden calf was worshipped in the desert (Exodus xxxii 6) the word translated "play" is the same as that which, in Genesis xxxix 14 and 17, is rendered "abuse." The true character of Roman games in honour of the gods is set forth in Tertullian's tract, *De Spectaculis*, and this should be remembered whenever Patristic authority is invoked against the practice of going to the theatre. (*P L* 1, 630—662) In no country which has been under Christian influence are certain acts seen in public, although heathen morality found in them nothing to blame. Moreover, Christian instinct has in every age taught thousands that their service of God will be most perfect if offered in the state of perfect chastity, in imitation of the Virgin Mother of their Lord and this life, so contrary to nature as to seem impossible, is found to be easy in virtue of the grace that God gives to those whom He calls The Christian religion has not yet secured that all men shall observe the law: but this much has notoriously been gained, that all who make any account of the name of Christian that they bear profess to hold purity in honour, and there is no public indulgence in immorality.

III The honour in which the Mother of God is held has led Christians to treat the weaker sex with respect, and show a deference to woman to which the most refined races of antiquity were total

The Christian Apologists constantly taunted the tyrants with their helplessness, and the failure of all their efforts to crush the rising community, these taunts would have been pointless had not the Government made such efforts, and yet they were boldly and publicly addressed to men who knew the truth and were themselves engaged in carrying out the measures of the Government Thus Tertullian told the Emperor Septimus Severus what the Emperor must have felt to be the truth "You mow us down, and we spring up in greater luxuriance each drop of Christian blood that you shed is a seed from which rises a harvest" (*Apol* c 50, *P L.* I, 555) This strife between the powers of the world and the faith of Christ began yet earlier. the Jewish Council commanded the Apostles to preach no more, and were met by the question, If it be just in the sight of God to hear you rather than God, judge ye No answer was forthcoming, so they had recourse to threats, imprisonment, and scourging, and they did not heed the wise advice of Gamaliel to let these men alone, for if their work were of men, it would come to nought. it has not come to nought, showing that it is not of men, but of God. The instructive history is read in the fourth and fifth chapters of the Acts of the Apostles

The same story has been repeated as often as the State, deserting its true work, has usurped the province of the Church, trying to be master where it should be nursing-father (Isaias xlix 23) The phases of the struggle are recounted by ecclesiastical historians, those who have maintained so unequal

a contest, unique in the world, must have been supported by a strength which is more than natural

72 —*Recapitulation* —In this chapter we have tried to show that the conversion of the Roman Empire to the Christian Faith was itself a moral miracle, proving that this Faith came from God, especially seeing that the attempt of Gibbon to account for this success by natural causes is a failure The marvel is the greater when we remember that this success was foretold by prophecy, that it altered the whole tone of society in many conspicuous points and that it was won in spite of the bad lives of many Christians, in defiance of the strenuous opposition of the State.

CHAPTER VII.

THE CERTAINTY OF THE CHRISTIAN REVELATION.

73. *Subject of the Chapter.*—In this chapter the force of the word "certain" is sketched, and it is shown that the Christian Revelation is shown to be Divine with full certainty.

74. *Definitions.*—We will now see what has been proved by the preceding chapters We maintain that miracles and prophecies render it *certain* that the Christian Revelation is Divine is the voice of God speaking to His creature, and demanding attention and submission The argument admits of indefinite development, but enough has been said to show its nature This all-important word *certain*, however, admits of a variety of meanings, which must be clearly understood If I consider a question which admits of only two answers, Yes and No, I may see that there are reasons in favour of Yes and reasons in favour of No, and if these reasons are equally balanced, or nearly so, I am left in doubt as to the answer, and am in no sense *certain*. But it may be that, although I see something in favour of No, yet the reasons that favour Yes are so far predominant that I have no hesitation in acting as if Yes were the truth, at the same time

that I feel a misgiving which I recognize as prudent, that possibly No may be the truth. In this case I am said to be *morally certain* of the answer Yes, in one sense, and that the looser and lower, of that much abused term; I have a sort of certainty sufficient to direct my conduct (*mores*). If I pay money into a bank in good repute, I am *morally certain* that my cheques will be honoured. A Christian must have more than this lower sort of moral certainty of the fact that God has spoken: as will be explained in the Treatise on Faith.

But I may see that the reasons in favour of Yes so far exceed those that favour No, that I cannot prudently attach any weight to these latter. If I pleased, I might by an effort of the will withdraw my attention from all that favours Yes, and fix my attention upon what favours No, but I feel that such a use of my will would be imprudent, and not according to reason. I am then *certain* of the affirmative in the proper sense of the term. The reasons for the affirmative may be derived from the nature of things, and the certainty is termed metaphysical; or from the rules by which inanimate and irrational beings act, and it is called physical; or it is moral, derived from what we know of the conduct of beings that are rational and free. Thus the immortality of the soul is metaphysically certain, that the fire will burn me if I touch it, is physically certain; while it is morally certain that my bank has failed, if the newspapers continue for three days to discuss the calamity The action of those concerned in getting up the papers is free, but it would

be imprudent in me to cling to any hope that they were conspiring to mislead the public It is in this sense that we assert the Divine origin of the Christian religion to be certain, with moral certainty.

Lastly, the reasons for the affirmative may so wholly outweigh those for the negative as to destroy them, or rather, there may be strong reasons for the affirmative, and no reasons at all that make for the negative When the thing comes before me in this shape it is said to be *evident*, and no effort of my will can avail to hinder my assenting. The axioms of geometry are metaphysically evident. the power of fire to burn is physically evident: the existence of America is morally evident to those who have never visited the country

75 *Cogency of the Argument* —In all these discussions it is understood that the matter is sufficiently proposed to me before I form a judgment: reasons of which I know nothing are to me non-existent, and do not affect my judgment. In saying that the laws of motion are physically certain, we mean to assert our belief that no normally constituted man can without imprudence doubt them, when what is to be said upon the subject is brought to his notice So with the Christian evidences, we believe that no normally constituted man can know and weigh them, and yet believe that it would be consistent with prudence to doubt their force The matter is not evident. it does not force itself on the intellect, but the will can, if it pleases, withdraw attention from the argument in favour of the Christian claim

and fix it on imaginary difficulties If it were evident, the act of faith would no longer be free, and the whole economy of the Christian scheme would be upset (See n 316) But although not evident, the Revelation cannot prudently be rejected, and there is therefore a duty to accept it with all its consequences. What these consequences are we shall inquire in future Treatises; accepting as a Divine message whatever comes to us, mediately or immediately, from Christ our Lord.

The fourth and fifth canons, on Faith, of the Vatican Council contain among other things the doctrine of this chapter (Denz 1660, 1661) The whole matter belongs more properly to the sixth Treatise, on Faith, to which the reader is referred; but it seemed convenient to sum up the result of our first Treatise in this place.

Treatise the Second.

The Channel of Doctrine.

CHAPTER I.

TRADITION.

76. *Scope of the Treatise*.—All Christians are in substantial agreement in regard to the matter dealt with in the preceding Treatise. There may be one or two arguments which would not be universally accepted, but the general conclusion is one which will not be questioned by any that bear the Christian name. We proved that Christ was certainly a Divine Messenger, and that therefore men are bound to exert themselves to inquire what message He brought, and to receive it, when ascertained, with implicit submission. And it is the interest as well the duty of each man to learn what the Divine Teacher delivered, for it must be a benefit to the creature to know what the Creator is pleased to communicate to him, whether it be an enforcement of truths which he might have learned, however imperfectly, by the use of his natural powers; such as some of the attributes of God, and the duty of just dealing: or new truths which his natural powers would never have discovered, such as the Trinity of

Persons in One God, and the duty of receiving Baptism

But Christ died many centuries ago. How are we who are now living to ascertain what His teaching was? There must be some way of doing so without reasonable misgiving: otherwise the revelation given by God publicly to one generation would have been lost to future generations, and so far wasted.

What, then, is this normal way of learning the doctrine delivered by Christ? All Christians have their answer to this question, but there is no agreement among them as to what this answer is. The Christians of the West are divided into two great sections upon the point. Catholics maintain that the man now living obtains the information primarily from the lips of his elder contemporaries: the others hold that it is to be obtained by the study of the Scriptures. The object of the present Treatise is to discuss these two theories.

In this discussion, we shall not only use the books from which the Divine Mission of Christ was proved in the preceding Treatise: but we shall freely employ all the books of the Scriptures and of early Christian writers as trustworthy witnesses to the teachings of Christ the authority of those books for that purpose is admitted by those with whom we have here to do Our next Treatise will be devoted to the questions that arise as to the peculiar character that attaches to the books of Holy Scripture, and distinguishes them from all other books

77. *Subject of the Chapter* —The present chapter will be devoted to explaining and proving the Catholic doctrine in that which follows the opposing view will be discussed It will be convenient at once to present an authoritative statement of the rival views

78 *The Rival Views* —The doctrine of the Catholic Church on the subject is declared by the Council of Trent The point had never been expressly defined before the sixteenth century because it had never been called in question It is found in the decree of the Fourth Session, held on April 8, 1546 We will take the translation from the work of the Rev J Waterworth. (*Decrees of the Council of Trent*, p 17)

"The sacred and holy œcumenical and general Synod of Trent, lawfully assembled in the Holy Ghost, the same three Legates of the Apostolic See presiding therein—keeping this always in view that, errors being removed, the purity itself of the Gospel be preserved in the Church, which (Gospel) before promised through the prophets in the Holy Scriptures, our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, first promulgated with His own mouth, and then commanded to be preached by His Apostles to every creature, as the fountain of all, both saving truth and moral discipline, and seeing clearly that this truth and discipline are contained in the written books and the unwritten traditions which, received by the Apostles from the mouth of Christ Himself, or from the Apostles themselves, the Holy Ghost dictating, have come down even unto us, transmitted

as it were from hand to hand, (the Synod) following the examples of the orthodox Fathers, receives and venerates with an equal affection of piety and reverence, all the books both of the Old and of the New Testament—seeing that one God is the Author of both—as also the said traditions, as well those appertaining to faith as to morals, as having been dictated either by Christ's own word of mouth, or by the Holy Ghost, and preserved in the Catholic Church by a continuous succession "

More shortly, we may say that according to this doctrine, Christian truth was delivered to the Apostles by the spoken word of Christ or by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and that it has come from them to us, partly committed to written books, and partly by unwritten tradition

The opposed view, which we may call that of Protestants, is held by almost all Western Christians who are not Catholics the only exceptions being the members of some sects, such as the Irvingites and Quakers, who seem to hold that God inspires each living man with a knowledge of the truth We shall say what is necessary concerning these in another chapter, when we prove that the public revelation of Christian doctrine was closed on the death of the last of the Apostles (nn 111, 112) An expression of the doctrine which will be admitted by the bulk of Protestants is found in the Sixth of the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion of the Established Church in England It runs as follows

"Of the Sufficiency of Holy Scripture for Salvation —Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary

to salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite necessary to salvation "

This is clearer than some other parts of these Articles of Religion The doctrine is often quoted in the form ascribed to Chillingworth The Bible, and the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants We shall try to show in the present chapter that the Tridentine method is that employed by Christ, inculcated by Him on His Apostles, employed by them, again inculcated by them on their immediate successors, employed by these successors, generation after generation, and never changed If this be made out, we shall have demonstrated that the way of oral tradition is the appointed way even at the present time In the next chapter we shall show the weakness of the arguments adduced in support of the Protestant view

79 *The Method used by Christ* —It is not disputed that Christ taught by word of mouth. There is no trace of any writing being attributed to Him, except the undoubtedly spurious letter to King Abgar of Edessa The text of this alleged letter may be read in Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl* 1, 13, *P G* 20, 121.) The letter itself bears testimony in favour of our contention, for it contains no instruction in Christian doctrine, but the writer is made to promise that He will in due time send one of His disciples to instruct the Syrian convert on the Protestant theory there ought to have been a promise to send a New Testa-

ment to Edessa as soon as it should be written The method actually used by Christ is to appeal to the Old Testament (St John v. 39—46), for the prophecies contained in it, along with His own miracles, were His credentials but He did not appeal to it as teaching His doctrine; on the contrary, He asserted His authority to be independent of it, or collateral with it, as when He claimed to be Lord of the divinely instituted Sabbath (St Mark ii 28, St Luke vi. 5); and He did not hesitate to abrogate parts of the Old Law, teaching a new and high morality in the Sermon on the Mount (St Matt v 21, 27, 31, 33), and giving the Samaritan woman to understand that Jerusalem was about to lose the prerogative, given it long ago by God, of being alone the place where acceptable worship could be offered to the Father. (St. John iv. 21, Deut xii 6)

80 *The Charge to the Apostles.*—The work of Christ was to be supplemented and continued by the action of His Apostles, who received their charge from Him The charge as to the work they were to do during the life of Christ may be read in the tenth chapter of St Matthew's Gospel, and the ninth chapter of that of St Luke. the sixth chapter of St Mark adds nothing to our purpose In these charges we find that the Apostles are commanded to preach and to heal the sick that is to say, to exhibit the credentials of miracles and to deliver an oral message not a word is said about writing; the Apostles are not commissioned to inculcate the observance of the Old Law, nor to promise that

the New shall be put into book form and distributed, and we learn from St Luke ix 6, that the Apostles fulfilled the command given them

The final commission was given to the Apostles by our Lord immediately before His Ascension We read of it in St Matt xxviii 20, St Mark xvi 15, St Luke xxiv 47, and Acts i 8 All these accounts agree in substance with the terms of the earlier mission The Apostles are not to write, but are to preach, to bear witness, to teach or make disciples of (μαθητεύσατε St Matt xxviii. 29) all nations, all which expressions certainly point to oral instruction But this later commission contains one most important element which is absent from the earlier St John's Gospel, supplementing the Synoptics in this as in so many other points, tells us that Christ promised His Apostles that, after His departure, He would send them another Paraclete, or Comforter, to abide with them for ever, Who should teach them all things and bring all things to their mind, whatsoever Christ should have said to them (St John xiv. 15—26) The purpose of this gracious promise is seen when it is renewed a part of the great commission (Acts i. 8), and we learn that it is to be through the abiding presence of this Comforter with the followers of Christ that His undertaking is to be fulfilled, that He will be with them in their work of teaching all days, even to the consummation of the world (St Matt xxviii. 20) There will be much to be said about this text hereafter. At present it may be enough to remark that this phrase, "be with you," in the language of

Scripture, imports infallible and effectual assistance the promise given in this form is never followed by failure (See Genesis xlviii 21, Amos v 14, Zach viii. 23, &c. The full list of the passages will be found in Murray, *De Ecclesia*, ii. 199, and see further, n. 206) We have here the Divine guarantee against any corruption of the teaching which the Apostles and their successors are to impart to all nations even to the consummation of the world the tradition that they hand on will not be a tradition of men, such as those for which the Pharisees made void the commandment of God (St. Matt. xv. 6), but it will be the word of the Spirit of the Father, speaking through His ministers. (St. Matt. x. 20.)

81 *Action of the Apostles*—That the Apostles acted on this commission will be seen in almost every chapter of the Acts. (See Acts i. 22, ii 14, iii. 12, ix. 20, &c) Nor does any other method appear in the Epistles These letters were for the most part written to supplement and enforce the writer's preaching (see 1 Cor xi. 2, 2 Cor. xi 4, Galat. i 8, Ephes i. 13, &c, St. James i. 22; 1 St. Peter i 12, 2 St Peter i. 21, St Jude i 3); in which last place it is to be observed that the original gives the force of "the faith which once came by tradition" (*παραδοθείσῃ*), the word employed being one which in different forms is *not* uncommon in the New Testament, and which, when applied to the faith, always signifies oral transmission (See St Matt xv. 2, St Mark vii. 5, 1 Cor xi. 2, 23, 1 Cor. xv 3, 1 St Peter i. 18) The only

exception is 2 Thess ii. 15, where it includes both oral teaching and the teaching of a written document.

Further, the Apostles charged their own immediate successors to observe the same method, showing hereby that its efficacy did not depend upon any peculiar character attaching to those who had received the charge from Christ Himself, but was intended to be a part of the permanent economy of the Church This is seen in the exhortation of St Paul to his disciple St Timothy, when he bids him be diligent in teaching (1 Timothy iv. 13), to avoid profane novelties of words (1 Timothy vi. 20), but especially in the command conveyed in the second chapter of the second Epistle, verse 2· "The things which thou hast heard of me by many witnesses, the same commend to faithful men who shall be fit to teach others also" It is to be remembered that at the time when this charge was given, the greater part of the New Testament was already in existence, yet reference is still made to the word of hearing and not to any written book

82 *The Second Century*—We find the same method in full vigour in the second century. St Clement of Rome, the disciple, as is supposed, whom St Paul mentions with praise (Philipp. iv. 3), belongs in fact to the first century, for his first Epistle to the Corinthians is assigned to the year 97 at the latest. Describing the constitution of the Church, he says (c 42, *PG* 1, 292) "The Apostles brought us the good message from our Lord Jesus Christ, Jesus Christ from God. Christ

was sent from God, the Apostles from Christ, and the will of God was duly fulfilled in both cases . . They preached in countries and in towns, and the first-fruits of their ministry, having tested them in the power of the Holy Spirit, they appointed to be overseers and ministers to all that should believe" And again in chapter 44 "The Apostles made these appointments and arranged a succession, that when they had fallen asleep other tried men should carry on their ministry" (*P G* 1, 298) This is an exact description of the Catholic system

St Irenæus belongs to the second century He wrote expressly against heresies, and he knows no other source of truth than the tradition which has come down from the Apostles "All that have the will to know the truth," he says (3, 3, 1, *P G* 7, 848), "may find in every Church the tradition of the Apostles which is known to all the world we can reckon up those whom the Apostles appointed to be Bishops and their successors down to our own day, who never taught nor knew any such absurdities as these men indulge in. Had the Apostles known secret mysteries, to be communicated secretly to the perfect, they to whom the Churches were committed would assuredly have received the knowledge. For the Apostles resolved that their successors should be perfect and blameless in all, when they handed to these their own function of teaching: for if these acted well things would go well, but great calamity would attend their fall." Again there is nothing about the Scriptures being the rule of faith.

83 *Tertullian's Prescription* —The last author we cite shall be Tertullian, whose work belongs to the end of the second century. He wrote a formal treatise on the argument with which we are now engaged, under the name *De Præscriptionibus* (*P L.* 2, 1.) The word *prescription* belongs to the Roman law, from which it was borrowed by Christian writers, being first used perhaps by Tertullian in this Treatise both the word and the thing are in constant use by theologians, and in many topics no more powerful argument can be found than that founded on prescription. English lawyers give the name of prescription to the title to certain forms of property founded upon lapse of time with undisturbed possession the fact that I have held the property for such a length of time without disturbance will sometimes be an answer to every claim that can be brought against me, let it be ever so well founded The Latin usage includes this, but is wider, extending as it seems to every case where a defendant in a lawsuit was able to put forward a consideration which cut the matter short without reference to the merits Thus in England in the days of the penal laws the plea that the plaintiff was a Popish Recusant Convict was an absolute answer to every claim, however just, and this would have been a case of prescription in the Roman but not in the English sense

The theological use of the word is this. The *prescription* of novelty is against any doctrine which can be shown to have originated at a time subsequent to the times of the Apostles· the *prescription*

of antiquity is in favour of a doctrine which can be shown to have been held at any time as part of their faith by all Christians, even though it cannot be shown to have been held at any earlier date The reason for the one is that a novel doctrine would require to be authenticated as a Divine revelation by miracle and prophecy, no less than the original mission of Christ and the reason of the other is that otherwise the promise of Christ to be with His Apostles in their teaching all days would have failed, through an admixture of false doctrine having polluted the true More will be said on this subject in our Treatise on the Church (See n 269)

The application of this principle to the heresies of his time is made by Tertullian in the nineteenth and following chapters of his work He declines to argue the points of difference on the basis of Scripture, for to do so gives rise to endless questions as to what books are to be considered authoritative and what is the meaning of the passages quoted. Neither party can hope to gain an acknowledged victory in such a contest but his appeal is to those to whom the Scripture belongs, through whom it has been handed down to us. to the possessors of the tradition which makes us Christians These are the apostolic Churches, founded in various cities throughout the world by those who received the commission from Christ Himself, or which are shoots or suckers proceeding from these parent stems, but establishing themselves with a separate life. Peaceful communication and recognition of

brotherhood and the tokens which secure admission to membership prove the unity of the association constituted by these several Churches What is taught in these mother Churches is truth, all else is falsehood.

84 *The work of Theology* —It follows from what has been said that to ascertain the truth on any point of doctrine it is enough to inquire what is held upon the subject by Christian communities throughout the world, and in this inquiry no account need be taken of communities which, although they keep the name of Christian, hold doctrines which are new, that is to say, opposed to what at some previous time was the universal belief All this will be better understood when we have explained the pre-eminent position held by the Roman Church and its Bishop, the Pope.

But although this inquiry teaches us with absolute assurance what is the tradition that has come to us from the Apostles, and although the ex-cathedral definition of the Roman Pontiff affords us a compendious way of knowing what would be the result of such an inquiry, yet it by no means follows that our doctrine leaves no place for the work of theologians Let the three modes of treatment of theological questions be called to mind, as described in our Introductory Remarks (n 6), and it will be found that they are still applicable, even after an infallible definition. The definition makes us certain what is the truth upon the point, and that this truth is contained in the Apostolic Tradition; but Positive Theology will still have its work

of showing *how* this doctrine is to be found in the monuments of this Tradition; Scholastic Theology fixes the precise sense of the terms employed, investigates the *causes* of the doctrine, in the philosophical sense of the word *cause*, and shows how it is connected with other branches of truth, while Polemical Theology strives to enter into the minds of those who have a difficulty in admitting the truth of the doctrine, explaining and illustrating it in various ways so as to guard against all risk of misunderstanding, and urging the *argumentum ad hominem*, by showing the dissentients that on principles which they avow that they admit, they ought to accept what we maintain After the definition, the theologian is encouraged to proceed with his work with greater confidence than he could have felt while the point was yet in doubt. he is by no means disposed to consider that his work is done

85 *Recapitulation* —In this chapter we have set forth the rival views of Catholics and Protestants as to the Rule of Faith, and have proved that the Catholic view was acted on by Christ, His Apostles, and their immediate successors we have explained the meaning of the word *prescription* and how it is employed in Theology, as affording a short and sure way of settling any disputed point, and we have shown that this prescription makes for the Catholic Rule and that our doctrine by no means supersedes the work of Positive, Scholastic, and Polemical theologians.

CHAPTER II.

THE PROTESTANT RULE OF FAITH.

86. *Subject of the Chapter.*—In the last chapter we showed that the true Rule of the Christian faith is the living voice of the Church of the present day proclaiming the tradition received from preceding generations, and divinely guaranteed from error In the present chapter we shall prove this more fully by examining the arguments adduced for the Protestant view, which is the only rival of that held by Catholics This view makes the Bible only be the Rule of Faith After stating some preliminary objections to this view, we shall discuss the arguments in its favour as given in Dr Harold Browne's *Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*, the most authoritative work upon the subject, and show that they fail to prove the point

87 *The Protestant Rule not Scriptural.*—As was before remarked, the Rule is expressed with perfect accuracy by the oft-quoted words of Chillingworth "The Bible, and the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants" This then is a fundamental part of their religion, that the whole of it is to be found in the Bible It is therefore curious to remark that this principle itself is not found in the Bible, nor, in fact, is there any pretence for saying that it is

found. The Bible cannot lay down this principle without speaking of itself as a whole, but it does not do so; there is no passage that so much as hints at the existence of any complete collection of the inspired Books of the New Law, and in fact there is no likelihood that any such collection was made until long after the death of the last Apostle. St Peter, it is true (2 St Peter iii 16), speaks of there being things hard to understand "in all the Epistles" of St Paul, but this reference, whatever it point to, is by no means enough to establish the Protestant Rule It is scarcely worth while to mention the almost childish use that has sometimes been made of the passage of the Apocalypse (xxii. 18, 19), where a curse is denounced against any man who should add to, or take away from, the words of the book of that prophecy. the book here referred to is obviously the Apocalypse itself, and not all that is contained in that collection of books which we call the Bible. The Apocalypse is probably put last in the collection because there is no other book of the same nature, and because there was an impression, not improbably correct, that it was the last to be written, and even if the verses just referred to, spoke of the whole collection, the woe would fall upon any one who put a book forward as inspired which had no just claim to that title, it would not touch one who maintained that a portion of God's revelation had never been recorded by any inspired writer, which is the Catholic position

88. *Prescription* — Further, Prescription is in favour of the Catholic view, and opposed to that of

the Protestants, for there certainly was a time when the Protestant Rule was not known We have seen (n 80) that the Apostles acted upon the Catholic principle, urging the claim of the living teacher to obedience, and the practice of the Church was the same in subsequent ages Among the scanty records of the proceedings of the first General Council held at Nice, in 325, we find no trace of appeal being made to Scripture as the sole authority, and we learn from St Athanasius, who was present, and took a leading part in the business of the Council, that when the Arianizing party wished to use none but Scriptural language in the definition of faith, the assembled Bishops refused to admit the principle, and chose the word *consubstantial*, which, though old, was not Scriptural. (St Athan *Epistola ad Afros Episcopos*, n. 6, *P.G.* 26, 1040.) Also, Socrates (*Hist Eccl.* 1, 10; *P G.* 67, 100), and Sozomen (*Hist Eccl* 1, 22; *P.G* 67, 924) tell how cordially Acesius, the Bishop of the schismatical Novatians, accepted the definition of the Council, and he added the reason, that it was nothing new, but was the tradition which had come down to him from the days of the Apostles One who was familiar with the Protestant Rule would not have spoken in this way.

The second General Council, held at Constantinople in 381, accepts the faith defined at Nice, because it is ancient. (Hardouin's *Councils*, 1, 824) In the third, held at Ephesus in 431, the Bishops accepted the exposition of the Nicene faith sent to them by St. Cyril of Alexandria, giving for reason

that it was in accord with what the Church had always held from the beginning, with the primitive tradition which was preserved incorrupt among Christians. (*Ibid* 1, 1365) Quotations of this sort might be multiplied indefinitely, what we have adduced are enough to show that the Council of Trent introduced no novelty when in the proemium to the decree on Justification adopted in the fifth session, it professed its intention of expounding that true and sound doctrine which Christ taught, which the Apostles handed down, and which the Catholic Church, under guidance of the Holy Spirit, ever retained The Vatican Council also acted on the old principle when it declared (Const 1, c 4, *de Fide et Ratione*) that the doctrine of faith revealed by God was a deposit entrusted by Christ to His Church, to be faithfully kept and declared with infallible certainty.

What has been said, makes it clear that the Catholic Rule is in possession, no one can assign a time when it was not in use The Protestant Rule, on the other hand, is barred by prescription it is discredited as a novelty Nothing can restore its credit except proof that a new revelation has been given by God, abolishing the old economy, and establishing the new in its place We shall now proceed to show how very little there is that can be found to say on behalf of the Protestant Rule

89 *Scripture* —We will first consider the texts of Scripture which are alleged to prove the sufficiency of the written word They will be found collected in Dr. Browne s work on the Articles, in the dis-

cussion of the Sixth Article We will copy them as they stand in the Protestant authorized version, to prevent all dispute, but we shall group them in such manner as will remove the necessity of repetition of our remarks. We shall find that not one of the texts is opposed to our doctrine

I Thus the Scripture tells us, that if men speak not according to the law and the testimony, it is because they have no light in them (Isaias viii 20), that the law of the Lord is perfect (Psalm xviii. 7); that the Scriptures are able to make us wise unto salvation (2 Timothy iii 15), and that it was a great privilege of the Jews that to them were committed the oracles of God (Romans iii 1.) But these passages are not to the purpose, for they all refer to the books of the Old Testament, for St Timothy cannot have learned the New Testament from his childhood, if, then, they have any bearing upon our question, they prove that the Christian Revelation contained nothing new, which will not be maintained They in fact teach us no more than that the Holy Scriptures are profitable reading, which we not only admit, but maintain, provided they are read under proper safeguards All good things may be abused, and the reading of Scripture is no exception

II. Again, St Luke wrote his Gospel that Theophilus might know the certainty of the things in which he had been instructed, and St Peter wrote his second Epistle that those whom he addressed might be able, after his decease, to have those things always in remembrance (2 St Peter i.

15) This last passage is obscure, and has received more than one interpretation, as may be seen in Cornelius à Lapide, but it certainly cannot put the matter higher than it is put by St Luke, and he teaches us no more than that writing is one useful way of preserving tradition; and we know that God has seen fit to use it; but St Luke does not tell us that it is the only means, and if he did say so, he would at the same time say that his Gospel contained the whole of Christian truth, making all subsequent writings superfluous The same remark applies to St. John xx 31.

III In Deut iv. 2, we are warned not to add to the word which the Lord commands, and the Pharisees are reproved for teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. (St Matt xv 9), and thus making the word of God of none effect by their tradition (St Mark vii. 13), along with which passages Dr. Browne also quotes the verse of the Apocalypse (xxii 18) on which we have commented (n 87), at the same time that he confesses that it may apply only to the book in which it occurs as we explained. These texts expose the crime of those who add to the Divine word by setting up inventions of their own as Divine revelations, but they do not touch those who proclaim a truly Divine revelation which they have received in addition to what had already been committed to writing; if they forbid all addition to the Old Law, the Christian Revelation falls under the condemnation

It is worth while to notice that in the verse of St. Matthew, where the authorized version has

"teaching for doctrines the commandments of men," the equally Protestant revised version has "teaching as their doctrines," while the Greek original is merely "teaching doctrines commandments," the Vulgate, followed by the Douay version, has "doctrines and commandments," which is in accord with the Septuagint version of the passage in Isaias (xxix 13) from which the words are taken, the Hebrew has "commandment of men, doctrine" It will be observed that among these versions it is the authorized that makes most for the purpose for which it is cited by Dr Browne, and in fact the words are one of the main supports of the Protestant cause. Dr Alford (ad loc) confesses that the words are in apposition, whereas both the Protestant versions make "doctrines" a predicate

IV We have just seen an instance where a translator appears to have been influenced by a doctrinal bias The first text in the next group shows the hopelessness of every attempt to make a translation "without note or comment," as is required by the Protestant Rule The passage is found in St John (v 39), and is rendered in the authorized version, "Search the Scriptures," as if it were a command It may be so, but it is by no means certain Dr Browne tells us that "it may be, and very likely ought to be translated, 'Ye search the Scriptures,'" merely stating what was the practice of the Pharisees Neither the form of the verb (ἐρευνᾶτε) nor the context decides the question; yet the authorized version gives the

rendering which seems to favour the Protestant view, without any hint that any other view is possible. The revised version is fairer, giving both the alternative renderings, as is done also by the Douay translators, who found the same ambiguity in the Latin (*scrutamini*), but by the course adopted, the revisors have acknowledged their inability to give a translation of the Scriptures, thus exhibiting a fatal flaw in the Protestant system of private judgment The great bulk of men must exercise their judgment on the translation, and here it is confessed that the work of translating is impossible Every translation is in truth a commentary, and the commentator is sometimes at a loss and sometimes prejudiced and fraudulent (n 156)

But even if the passage be taken as giving a command, the sense ascribed to it by St Augustine, St Chrysostom, and Theophylact, as may be seen in à Lapide, it fails to bear out the Protestant advocate The meaning is the same as that conveyed by the place in St Matthew (xxii. 29), where our Lord points out that ignorance of the Scriptures is the cause of error, and to the same effect, the Berœans are praised (Acts xvii 11) because they "searched the Scriptures daily, whether these things were so" All these passages refer to Jews who admitted the authority of the Scriptures, and who ought to have found enough in these books to lead them to accept Christ as the Deliverer promised by the Prophets. The Berœans did not search the Scripture to verify the doctrine preached by St. Paul, such as the necessity of Baptism, and had they

done so they would have been disappointed, for the Old Testament does not teach the necessity of Christian Baptism, but they searched to see whether the prophecies quoted by St Paul bore the meaning which he put upon them, for this being ascertained, his authority to teach followed without further proof. (See Acts xiii. 32, xvii. 2, 3, xviii 28, xxvi 27, also n. 204) In the same way, we have appealed to the Scriptures in our last chapter as establishing the Catholic Rule of Faith, and we shall make the same appeal when treating of the Church, and elsewhere It is an appeal which will not be declined by those to whom our argument is addressed

It is to be observed that St Paul makes no use of the Old Testament when addressing Gentiles in proof of his mission, for instance, when at Athens, he quotes the Greek poet (Acts xvii 28) as an authority having weight with his hearers, but he makes no reference to the Prophets, of whom they knew nothing

90 *Reason*—Having exhausted his Scriptural arguments, Dr Browne attempts to show that Reason favours the Protestant view, and first he says that Tradition is proverbially uncertain, and that it failed to maintain purity of doctrine under the Old Law, whereas Scripture has secured us a knowledge of the great doctrines of the Trinity, Incarnation, and many more We reply that whatever may have been the case with Tradition under the Old Law, that of the New Law has no uncertainty if, as we hold, it has been divinely guaranteed

to us; and that Scripture, apart from the living voice of a teacher, has wholly failed to keep the great doctrines alive, for these doctrines are rejected by many who hold Scripture in reverence, but refuse to listen to Tradition To our argument that Tradition was the first rule, he replies that it may have been changed, but he offers no proof that it actually was changed; he admits that Scripture is not written systematically, but urges that this casual collection of memoirs and letters may, under God's providence, have been so ordered as to convey all Christian truth No one would deny that this may have been so, but the question is, whether we have any reason to believe, in defiance of appearances, that it was so He thinks that Apostolic authorship is sufficient to establish the character of a book as being a portion of the Scripture, unaware, it would seem, that Apostolic authorship is by no means identical with inspiration, the special character of Scripture It would seem that Dr Browne has failed to grasp our idea of Tradition, as being the voice of the living Church, for he seems to think that it is to be searched for in the writings of the Fathers, whereas we hold that the voice of the Church of the nineteenth century is as authoritative as that of the Church of the second century The voice of the living man tells us what is the truth, the researches of the theologian may go to show us that this truth was explicitly known fifteen hundred years ago, but our faith does not rest on his researches

Dr. Browne quotes some

passages from the Fathers as showing that they looked on Scripture as the exclusive Rule We will not go through them all It is enough to say that some mean that all things are contained in Scripture, inasmuch as it is by Scripture that we know the Divine origin of the Christian dispensation There are others which speak of the perfection of Scripture Scripture being the work of God, is certainly perfect with the perfection which God designed for it, but whether it was designed to contain all Christian truth is the point in question Lastly, when the Fathers combat a heretic who is setting up a doctrine which is avowedly not contained in Tradition, they may challenge him to adduce Scripture proof for it, by way of illustrating the want of all basis for his novel speculations

92. *Recapitulation*—In this polemical chapter, we have shown that the Protestant Rule is not Scriptural, and that Prescription is against it; after which we have dealt with what Dr Browne has found to urge in favour of his Rule, from Scripture, Reason, and the Fathers.

CHAPTER III.

MONUMENTS OF TRADITION.

93. *Subject of the Chapter.*—We have seen (n. 6) that it is the work of the Positive theologian to investigate the monuments of Tradition, and show that the faith of the Church held at the present day has been held with more or less explicitness in all former ages, or at any rate has not been contradicted In the present chapter, and the next, we shall discuss the materials that he uses in this work Far the principal among these is the Holy Scripture, the relations of which to Tradition shall form the subject of the following chapter, next come the writings of those men of theological learning of the earlier times of the Church who go by the name of Fathers, with whom we shall be chiefly occupied during the present chapter, but first something must be said concerning some monuments of Tradition which admit of shorter treatment.

94 *Formal Definitions* — The most explicit declaration of the consent of the living Church is obtained when an express definition of doctrine is put forward, or an anathema is pronounced on error This may be done by the Roman Pontiff, either acting alone, as when, in 1854, Pius IX defined the

doctrine of the Immaculate Conception; or confirming the decrees of a General Council, as the decrees of the Vatican Council of 1870 were confirmed by the same Pontiff When a doctrine is defined in this manner, it becomes part of the Catholic faith, the denial of which is the sin and crime of heresy

95 *The Liturgy and Ritual.*—It is a principal part of the work of the Church to direct the devotions of the Christian people, whence it follows that whatever doctrine can be deduced from the prayers and ceremonies sanctioned for use in any country, must be supposed to be the belief of the people of that country, and the Sacred Liturgy and Ritual, so far as they are common to the Universal Church, guide us to a knowledge of what the Church holds This principle is set forth in a letter written by Pope St. Celestine, about the year 431, to certain Bishops of Gaul, in which he argues against the Pelagians for the necessity of grace, and founds an argument upon what he calls "the sacraments, or mysteries, of the prayers of priests, handed down from the Apostles, and in constant use throughout the world and in every orthodox Church, so that the law guiding our supplications affords a rule for our belief" (St Cœlest I. Epist 21; *P L* 50, 537, Denz 95) Thus, the genuflection of the priest immediately after he has pronounced the words of institution in the Mass, shows that now for the first time there is an Object on the altar deserving reverence; nor can it be doubted that this reverence is an act of *latria*, or Divine

worship, offered to our Lord, really present. This particular ceremony has not always been in use, and although its presence is a proof that the belief which it symbolizes is held, it would be a mistake to suppose that its absence from the liturgy at any particular date gave any indication that at this date the belief was unknown Its presence has a positive force, its absence has no force at all

96 *History*—The importance of history as a source of knowledge of the doctrine held by the Church in former times, scarcely needs illustration It may be enough to mention the story of the finding of the Holy Cross at Jerusalem, by the Empress St Helena This is mentioned by St Cyril of Jerusalem, more than once, and he was writing on the spot about the year 345, or twenty years after the event (see *Catech Myst* 4, 10, 10, 19, 13, 4, *P.G* 33, 467, 685, 776), and later, but with fuller detail, by Sulpicius Severus (*Hist. Sacr.* 2, 34, *P.L* 20, 148), from whom the story passed into ordinary history. Whether or not we think that these authorities outweigh the negative argument drawn from the silence of Eusebius in the passage (*De Vita Constantini*, cc 42—46, *P G* 20, 1101—1105) where he describes the pious munificence of St Helena on occasion of her visit to the Holy Places, it is at least clear that St Cyril and Sulpicius regarded it as natural that the holy Empress should esteem and honour the sacred relic, and this indirect testimony of history is often of no less value than its uncontroverted statements. A forger or inventor will set down nothing which does not at

least seem to his contemporaries to be what is likely to have happened

There is a remark which is true of all sciences, but which finds special application to the science of history An imperfect acquaintance with the science may seem to raise difficulties against the truths of faith, but a fuller acquaintance with its teaching causes these difficulties to disappear Truth can never contradict truth, and the supernatural teachings of faith will never be found in opposition to natural knowledge, provided this is certain, and not mere fancy

A peculiar character attaches to that branch of history which is concerned with the lives and deaths of martyrs, who laid down their life for the faith When these men were brought before governors and kings, to answer for their neglect to comply with the laws, it was not they that spoke, but the Holy Ghost. (St. Mark xiii. 11.) Hence it is no wonder that the Church has always been diligent in collecting the "Acts" of the martyrs, and amidst much that cannot be trusted, many documents of undoubted antiquity survive, detailing the circumstances under which each attained his victory The narratives are most interesting and full of instruction on various subjects; and among the rest they incidentally throw much light upon the belief of the Church at the time. Anastasius, in his Lives of the Roman Pontiffs, names St. Clement as having assigned the seven regions of the city to seven Christian notaries, or shorthand writers, whose business was to set down the story

of the martyrs (*P.L* 127, 1079) This would have been in the first century St Aneros is said by the same authority (*Ibid* 1331) to have lost his life in 237, a victim to his zeal in securing the safe custody of the notarial reports; and St Fabian, in the following year, is reported to have appointed seven subdeacons to superintend the seven notaries These notices, however, cannot be trusted as being historical, so far as names and dates go; but they seem to testify to a tradition that the matter was regarded as being of public concern in the Church of Rome, and there is evidence that the same was the case in other Churches

97. *Archæology*.—Lastly, among these minor topics, we may mention the study of the remains of Christian art as a means of learning what was the belief of the Church. The artist uses a language which is, it is true, less readily intelligible than the language of literature, but when the key to its meaning is once secured, it is vastly more impressive. Thus, in the *Real-Encyclopédie* of F. X Kraus, we have (1, 344) a representation of the Prophet Habbakuk caught by the hair of the head as he carries a basket of provisions It is impossible to doubt that the artist who drew this picture, accepted the account of this incident as being an integral part of the Book of the Prophet Daniel (Daniel xiv 32—38), and in this way we have proof that the canon of Scripture, as accepted in the days of the artist, was wider than that which Protestants accept at the present day; and if the caricature where "Alexamenus worships his God" by kneeling

before a crucified ass, be really directed against the Christians, it gives us very early proof of the adoration of the crucifix

98 *The Fathers*.—But to come to the proper subject of this chapter. The Christian Fathers are not a class that admit of precise definition It would be against common usage to apply the name "Father" to any modern writer, whatever might be his other claims to the title, and especially whatever might be the style in which he treated theological questions, a certain antiquity is requisite before an author can be put in the class of the Fathers On the other hand, we cannot reckon all early Christian writers as being among the Fathers, for Constantinople produced many historians who were Christians, yet whom no one would reckon among the Fathers The Episcopal character is not necessary, as has sometimes been thought, for no one will dispute the claim of St Jerome to the title, nor is sanctity needed, for not to come down beyond the beginning of the third century, Tertullian died in heresy, Origen has the credit of the same, and Clement of Alexandria, though a Catholic, is not esteemed as a saint, yet none of the Fathers have more authority than these, as witnesses to the doctrine of their time. In fact, the appellation, "Father," is more or less arbitrary, distinguishing certain writers from the inspired Prophets and Apostles to whom we owe the Sacred Books on the one hand, and from those called "Schoolmen" on the other. In this way, the Fathers are the great bulk of Christian writers on theological matters who are later than the first

century and earlier than the middle of the twelfth But no strict chronological limit is possible for, as already remarked (n 6), St. Anselm, the first of the Schoolmen, is older than St Bernard, the last of the Fathers Understanding the term "Fathers" in this way, it is plain that their authority is of great weight as witnesses of the Christian Tradition Putting aside for the moment the superintendence of Divine Providence, which preserves the doctrine of the Church in its purity, the Fathers, especially the earlier among them, are good witnesses to the primitive revelation, inasmuch as they are near the time when it was given, so that there had been less opportunity for error to creep in Also, many of them were distinguished for their deep and varied learning, their ability and their sanctity, which adds weight to their authority as witnesses to Divine truth But perhaps the most important consideration is that they often gave their testimony before any question was raised, and as it were unconsciously. The strong expressions used by them will disclose the view that they had imbibed from their teachers, in a manner that is perfectly satisfactory, even when they use expressions which at a later date, when controversy was raging, might have seemed inaccurate

In all cases where we have the unanimous consentient voice of the Fathers, testifying to the tradition that they had received, there will be no difficulty in admitting that their evidence proves what was the belief of the Church in their time. Whoever does not accept this witness is a follower

of profane novelties of words, coming under the condemnation of St. Paul (1 Timothy vi 20)

It is to be kept in mind that this special authority which attaches to the Fathers as witnesses, does not cover every sentiment that is found in their writings; especially, in their interpretation of Scripture, they sometimes testify to the Tradition of the Church as to the meaning of a particular passage, but sometimes also they give the conclusion that they personally have come to, using such materials for forming a judgment as were available in their time In these cases they act as critics, not as witnesses

99 *Tests of Unanimity* —It will seldom, perhaps never, happen that all the Fathers speak upon a particular question, and it would be vain, therefore, to rest upon the authority of their unanimous voice, as explained in the preceding paragraph But even when we are left without direct evidence of their unanimity on any question, we often can prove indirectly what their view was For the circumstances may be such that the voice of a few expresses with certainty the mind of all This will be understood when we call to mind the horror which error regarding the faith excited in early times St John the Evangelist won the name of the Apostle of Love In his second Epistle (verse 5), his exhortation was "that we love one another." Yet with all this gentleness, he expresses his horror of novel doctrines, when a few verses after (verse 10) he says, "If any man come to you and bring not this doctrine"—the doctrine which he had taught—

"receive him not into the house, nor say to him, God speed you." The same loving spirit is also exemplified in the anecdote of St John, preserved by St Jerome in his Commentary on St. Paul to the Galatians (vi. 10), where he tells us that the holy Apostle in his old age wearied his disciples by incessantly repeating "My children, love one another" (*P L.* 26, 433), but the hatred of error comes out in another anecdote told us concerning the same St. John by St. Irenæus (*Contra Hæreses*, 3, 4, *P.G* 7, 853) and by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles* 3, 28 and 4, 14; *P.G.* 20, 276 and 337) that he feared to remain under the same roof with Cerinthus the heretic. As long as this spirit prevailed, or was held worthy of admiration, we may be assured that no group of writers could teach a novelty without rousing those who heard them to protest

100 *Single Witnesses.*—In some instances the testimony of a single ancient writer is conclusive as to the belief of the Church in his time, at any rate upon some special subject Thus, certain letters written by St. Cyril of Alexandria were received by the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon as the "rule of the faith:" their statement of the true tradition upon the Incarnation can be trusted (See the authorities collected in Fessler, *Institutiones Patrologiæ*, 2, 550 n) In the case of St Gregory of Nazianzum, sometime Patriarch of Constantinople, we may go further, for Rufinus expresses the general judgment of theologians when he says that whoever fails to follow the doctrine of St. Gregory, without limitation of subject, must be regarded as

a heretic. (See the authorities in Fessler, *Instit Patrol* 1, 582) But perhaps the most famous instance of this sort is the case of St. Hilary of Poitou, who receives a special encomium from St Jerome himself This Saint wrote a long letter to his friend St. Laeta, giving her various practical directions as to the education of her daughter, Paula, and among other things he prescribes a course of reading, and he says that she will find nothing to lead her wrong in the Letters of Athanasius or in the works of Hilary (St Hieron. Epist. 107, n 12, *P L* 22, 877)

These cases, however, are exceptional Generally speaking we must expect to find some passages in the works even of the greatest Fathers which looked at by themselves, seem to convey a sense opposed to the doctrine of the Church, among human writers, absolute inerrancy belongs only to the Roman Pontiff, when speaking *ex cathedra*, as will be explained in its place. When, then, we seem to find in an author of repute a passage which seems *inconsistent with what is known from other sources* to be the truth, we must first make sure that we have not been misled by a false text; a subject on which we still have need to keep in mind the warning given by St. Jerome to Laeta in the place just quoted Errors of copyists are for this purpose as injurious as wilful forgeries. Next, we must ascertain whether we really grasp the author's drift, and especially we must not hastily assume that the terms as used by him have the same meaning as when used by other writers Language is an imper-

fect instrument for conveying thought, and it is seldom that any writer distinctly expresses the whole of what he means · it is enough if he makes sure that he will not be misunderstood by those for whose immediate benefit he is writing, he cannot hope to preclude all risk of error on the part of readers for all time. In short, we must make sure that we understand the *Status quæstionis* as it was in the mind of the author.

When the author's meaning is thoroughly grasped, it may turn out that he used language which was harmless at the time, but which afterwards became associated with error, either by positive assertion, or by omission of some word which became the badge of orthodoxy. But it may also be seen to be necessary to abandon the defence of the passage and to acknowledge that the writer's mind was not in accord with the truth as may happen blamelessly on points that have not yet been defined by the Church When it is necessary thus to recede from the doctrine taught by some venerable Father, it should be done with all expressions of respect St Augustine was unable to follow the doctrine of St Cyprian, who denied the validity of baptism administered by heretics, and he speaks as follows (St Aug *De Baptismo*, 6, 2; *P L* 43, 199) "With all reverence and honour for the gentle Bishop and glorious Martyr Cyprian, I do not hesitate to say that on the subject of heretical Baptism he thought otherwise than as the truth afterwards appeared"

Many illustrations of what we have been saying

will be found in Fessler, when he enumerates the doctrines peculiar to each of the Fathers whose life and works he treats St. Justin Martyr affords a good example (1, 220)

101 *St Augustine*.—It will be observed that in cases like those of St Cyril, St Gregory, and St Hilary, we regard them as safe guides because their writings have been examined and have been found to be free from error. They are not judges whose decision is authoritative and final, but they are witnesses who testify to the doctrine of the Church in their time, and their witness has been examined and found to be truthful This principle was forgotten by some persons whose admiration for one of the greatest doctors of the Church led them to raise him from the witness-box to the bench, with the result that something of a slur has been cast upon his name

Among the writers whom God has raised up to enlighten His Church and defend her doctrine, a place among the first, if not the very first place, must be given to St Augustine, who for keenness of intellect, enormous and varied learning, quickness of insight, and zeal and success in combating heresies the most diverse, has scarcely an equal among the Fathers The writings of St. Augustine were the principal store-house whence the Scholastics drew that matter which they put into shape and arranged, to form the theology of the Church. Testimonies concerning him will be found collected in Fessler (2, 433) Especially, St Augustine's authority stands high on all questions

connected with Grace, and we shall find that there are portions of the defined doctrine of the Church which are taken textually from his writings, and Suarez holds that the note of "rashness" would attach to any attempt of a private theologian to contradict any part of the teaching of St. Augustine on Grace. (*Prolegom.* 6, in Tract *de Gratia*, c 6, n 17.)

But there are certain other subjects of which the same could not be said, and phrases may be found in the writings of the great African Doctor, especially on the subject of free-will, which taken simply by themselves, without reference to the meaning which they bear in their proper place, are indefensible In the sixteenth century, Baius of Louvain advocated certain views on this subject, which he professed to draw from St. Augustine, and these views were condemned by Pope St Pius V. in 1567 (Denzinger, *Enchir.* nn. 881—959.) Nevertheless, the teaching of Baius was supported by Jansenius, and in his hands became the foundation of the Jansenist heresy. This writer and his followers maintained that no account need be taken of Pontifical condemnations in face of the clear teaching of St Augustine, which he termed irrefragable, and Pope Alexander VIII, in 1690, deemed it necessary to clear the ground by condemning the following proposition (Denz n 1187). "When a doctrine is found to be solidly based on Augustine, it may be held and taught, without regard to any Pontifical Bull." A discussion of the whole matter will be found in Viva (*Theses Damnatæ*, part 3,

prop. 30, Alex VIII) The condemnation was based upon the principle that no appeal is admissible from the living Church of the present day to the Church of past ages The meaning of the present pronouncement is beyond doubt, whereas the ancient writer is not here, to explain what he meant, besides which, the present pronouncement undoubtedly represents the mind of the whole Church, whereas the ancient witness may have been mistaken in the testimony that he bears It is to be observed that the condemnations in question were in form the utterances of the Popes alone, but they were accepted by the Bishops of the Church, with moral unanimity, and therefore certainly expressed the mind of the Church, without reference to the doubt which existed at that time as to the infallibility of the Pope

102 *Doctors*—It may be convenient to mention some of the various senses attaching to the word *Doctor* It signifies primarily a Teacher, especially one who has received public license to teach from some University, thus we have Doctors of Medicine, of Law, and of Theology Originally no one was allowed to teach publicly until he had received the degree of Doctor, and even now it is obligatory on the holders of certain positions in the Church to qualify themselves by obtaining the degree of Doctor of Theology or of Canon Law, but for the most part, the degree no longer confers any special privileges Some eminent teachers of the thirteenth and following centuries received complimentary epithets which have remained in use, and become

a kind of proper name, although the special appropriateness is often obscure Some seventy cases of this kind will be found enumerated in the Freiburg *Kirchen Lexicon* of Wetzer and Welte, *s v.* "Doctor," the best known being the name of Angelic Doctor, applied to St Thomas Aquinas More loosely, the name of Doctor has been applied to all teachers, without reference to academical qualification, but in a special sense it is given to certain Servants of God who have joined eminent learning to remarkable sanctity, and on whose feasts the Church has sanctioned the use of a special Mass and Office (See Benedict XIV. *De Canonizatione*, lib 2, part 2, c. 11, n 13) Four such have long been recognized belonging to the Eastern Church, SS Athanasius, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzum, and Chrysostom, and as many in the West, SS Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, and Gregory the Great It is possible that the selection of this number was primarily the work of Christian artists, but it has been long sanctioned by the Church The first increase in the number occurred in the sixteenth century, when the title was formally conferred by St Pius V. upon the Dominican St Thomas Aquinas, and by Sixtus V upon the Franciscan St Bonaventure: each Pope promoting his Religious brother

Of late years, the Mass and Office of a Doctor has been granted in the case of a large number of saints It will be observed that the grant does not imply any special approbation of the doctrine of the writer so honoured, it merely testifies in general to the greatness of his learning, conjoined with

sanctity. In the case of St Alphonsus Liguori, a decree was issued by the Penitentiaria in 1787, declaring that his moral doctrine might always be followed with safety, but this is not the same thing as declaring that it is true the title of Doctor was not conferred upon him till 1871

103 *Bishops and People*—The promise of Divine assistance in the work of teaching, which is the ground of our belief that the Church will not fail, was made primarily to the Apostles (St Matt. xxviii 20) and through them to their successors, the Bishops of the Church, under the headship of the Roman Pontiff as will be explained in the Treatise on the Church These constitute the Teaching Church (n 203) all other Christians are the Taught There is no direct Divine guarantee that the Taught shall be preserved in the truth but indirectly we are assured that, as a body, they will never fall into error, for this could happen only through some failure on the part of the Teachers, such as is inconsistent with the promise of help that they have received What is here said applies not only to the mere multitude of the faithful, but also to priests and other men of theological learning who teach in the public schools under the supervision of the Episcopacy and of the Holy See It is a remark of Melchior Canus (*De Locis Theologicis*, 8, 1) that there has always been a close connection between contempt for the Schools of the Church and the bane of heresy, and the general consent of the faithful people has in all ages been regarded as a test of truth or falsehood.

104. *Recapitulation*.—In this chapter we have considered the sources of our knowledge of the doctrine held by the Church in former times. These are, besides Scripture, formal definitions, the Liturgy, History, including especially the Acts of the Martyrs and the works of the Fathers. The meaning of this word is explained, and the reasons are explained why the consent of many of the Fathers, or even in certain circumstances the doctrine taught by one alone, guides to a knowledge of the doctrine of the whole Church. The peculiar case of St Augustine is explained, as is the force of the title "Doctor of the Church," and finally it is pointed out that the Episcopate is the primary depositary of the tradition of the Church, all others being kept in the truth in virtue of their adherence to the body of Bishops.

CHAPTER IV.

SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION.

105. *Subject of Chapter*.—If we put in this place the whole of the doctrine as to the relation of Scripture and Tradition, it would fill a long chapter: but much of the subject has been anticipated in earlier chapters of the present Treatise, and more will be given in the next Treatise on Holy Scripture. In that Treatise we shall see the special and altogether unique dignity that attaches to the Sacred Books, distinguishing them from all other existing books, in that they came from no human author and are free from the slightest taint of error. We shall do no more in this place than vindicate some points in which the divinely conserved Tradition of the Church has superiority over the written Word of God.

106. *Tradition prior in Time and Thought*.—We have already (nn. 79—81) shown that Christian Tradition existed before the Christian Scriptures were written. This is obvious, and is admitted on all hands. The method of teaching by the living voice of authoritative witnesses was in use on the first feast of Pentecost, when the Church was instituted, and there is no indication forthcoming

that the method underwent any subsequent change. Tradition is undeniably prior in time to the New Testament Scriptures

Not only did the Tradition of the Church exist before the New Testament was written, but we cannot think of the Scriptures as having authority in determining the belief of Christians, without first thinking of the Christian Tradition The reason why we look upon the Gospels and Epistles as having peculiar authority, is that such is the belief of the Christian Church in other words, such is the teaching of Tradition No other reason can be alleged, for no book can prove its own authorship with certainty, any more than a man's asseverations of his own truthfulness add a scrap to our reasons for believing his story. If what we know of him from other sources does not incline us to believe him when he tells his story, neither does it incline us to believe him when he says that his story is true But, besides this, no book of the New Testament makes claim to the possession of any special character, still less does it make such a claim on behalf of the whole collection there is no clear indication that one of the sacred writers conceived himself to be contributing to a collection which should possess a unique character No doubt, every writer of history makes an implicit claim to be considered credible, but this is not enough to entitle a book to be looked upon as forming part of the Scriptures, for many credible histories have been written which are not regarded as Scripture, and what we are insisting upon is the absence of

any claim to the possession of the peculiar character which we ascribe to the books of the New Testament.

107. *Wider in Scope*.—Further, there is matter contained in the Tradition of the Church which is not contained in Scripture, while on the other hand there is nothing in Scripture which is not in Tradition. This last is clear because Tradition embraces Scripture and looks upon Scripture as the chiefest instrument by which Tradition is handed down. On the other hand, Tradition contains some matters which are not in Scripture. First and principally, Tradition teaches us the authoritative character attaching to the Scripture, as we saw at length in the last paragraph. But besides this, there are many points which are accepted by the great bulk of Protestants as part of the Christian religion in spite of the weight of purely Scriptural argument seeming decidedly opposed to them. In these cases, the Catholic theologian, under the guidance of Tradition, and knowing the truth, is able to show that the words of Scripture are not conclusive, at the same time that the Scriptural argument is too strong to be resisted by those who have no other guide. We will point out some of these cases.

I. *Infant Baptism*.—The great bulk of Protestant sects employ infant Baptism, yet there is no trace in Scripture of Christian Baptism being administered to any one who was not capable of asking for it, while there are many places in which certain dispositions—faith or repentance, or both—are mentioned as necessary conditions. The practice of infant

Baptism therefore cannot be defended on Scriptural grounds (See St. Mark xvi 16, Acts ii 38, 41, viii 12, 37.) Dr Browne, in his Exposition of the 27th of the Thirty-nine Articles (pp 671—676), after some irrelevant remarks on Jewish ceremonies, urges the hardship of excluding infants from the benefits promised to the baptized, an unsafe argument in dealing with the positive institution of God, and one which would go to prove that water might be dispensed with in Baptism if it were unattainable a conclusion which Dr Browne would not admit He then quotes some passages showing that the children of Christian parents were in an advantageous position, which may refer merely to the benefit of education, and lastly he points out that the Apostles baptized whole households (Acts xvi 15, 33, 1 Cor i 16), and assumes that there were infants among the members of these households, and that these infants were baptized; whereas the phrase "the household was baptized" is abundantly satisfied if all the capable members received that Sacrament This writer is then glad to support his doctrine from the Fathers, that is to say, to admit the force of Tradition

II. *Indissolubility of Marriage* —Most Protestants, at least until recent times, maintained the Catholic doctrine of the indissolubility of consummated marriage of Christians Yet the student of "the Bible and the Bible only" could hardly fail to come to the conclusion that there was an exception, expressly authorized by Christ (St Matt. v 32), which full statement of the doctrine must stand,

although the exception is not mentioned by St Mark (x. 11) nor by St. Luke (xvi 18) The full explanation of this difficult matter must be reserved for our Treatise on the Sacrament of Matrimony. The embarrassment of Protestant divines will be seen by reference to the note in the *Speaker's Commentary*.

III *Feet Washing*—If the earlier part of the thirteenth chapter of St John's Gospel be read (vv. 1—7), we see that our Lord on the last night of His mortal life, washed the feet of His disciples, and taught them that unless He washed them they should have no part with Him Further, that they ought to wash one another's feet, and if they did so, they should be blessed. We seem here to have the formal institution of an obligatory rite, to the due observance of which a special blessing is attached, while to neglect it is spiritually disastrous. And we learn also (1 Timothy v 10) that to use the rite was one of the marks of an upright Christian. Nevertheless, with insignificant exceptions, the rite has never been in use, and the practice of the Church assures us that "to wash the saints' feet" is a phrase for readiness to embrace opportunities of doing acts of kindness, even when they are humiliating, but one who knew nothing of the matter beyond what the Scripture teaches, would have no ground for so understanding the passages

IV. *Eating Blood.*—The Israelites were forbidden to eat the blood of any creature whatsoever. (Levit vii 26, and many other places) The motive of this law was perhaps partly sanitary, but it also, no doubt, had reference to the Divine decree by which

the redemption of mankind was destined to be purchased by the shedding of the Precious Blood on Calvary. This law is still observed by the Jews. In the earliest days of the Church, probably within twenty years of the Death of Christ, a question arose, how far Gentile converts were bound to observe the Law of Moses, and the Apostles and others gathered together at Jerusalem to discuss the point The proceedings are narrated in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles The result was that the Council sent a circular letter addressed in form to the Gentile converts of Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia, but which is referred to in Acts xxi 25, as being applicable to all Gentiles, and this letter insists on the duty of abstaining from blood Nothing but the Tradition of the Church assures us that this prohibition has ceased to be binding.

V. *Oaths*—In the Sermon on the Mount we have a distinct precept of Christ not to swear at all (St Matt. v. 34), and St James would have Christians "above all things, swear not." (St James v. 12) No words can be plainer, and the context limits them only so far as to indicate by the examples adduced, that the prohibition is confined to oaths properly so called It is to no purpose therefore that Dr Browne, defending the ordinary practice of men against certain fanatical sectaries, in his comment on the last of the Thirty-nine Articles, adduces certain forms of speech which are employed occasionally by St Paul (Romans ix. 1; 1 Cor xv. 31, &c.) as proof that the Apostle considered it lawful to take an oath, these forms are

something different from oaths Nor does it avail him more to quote the example of our Lord, Who suffered Himself to be adjured (St Matt xxvi 63), for this was the act of the High Priest, not of Christ, but to take an oath is the act of the witness, not of the judge and by permitting the High Priest to act in this way, He no more sanctioned his action than He sanctioned His own condemnation, which He suffered this same High Priest to pronounce

VI No point of the popular religion of Protestants is more prominent than the strictness with which they observe the weekly rest on Sunday, and the duty is constantly rested upon that commandment of the Decalogue which forbids work on the Sabbath The belief is wide-spread among ignorant Protestants that the Sunday is the Sabbath, whereas nothing is more certain than that Sunday is observed as the day of the Resurrection of our Lord, which took place on the day following the Sabbath. (St. Luke xxiii 56) The Jews have preserved the true reckoning, and they rest on the Saturday. Such Protestants as know better than to fall into this confusion, feel the need of discovering a Scriptural basis for their practice of observing Sunday, but they find nothing better than some indications that Christians were accustomed to meet for worship on the first day of the week (Acts xx 7; 1 Cor xvi 2), but there is nothing in these passages to impose a perpetual obligation, or to show that this observance is of Divine institution Again we are driven to Tradition and the practice of the Church, to justify the existing usage.

We may conclude this discussion by citing two passages from the Fathers, in which our principle is stated with great plainness. St Epiphanius, who wrote about the year 370, combats certain heretics with arguments derived from Scripture, and then goes on (*Adv. Hæreses*, 61, 6; *P G* 41, 1048) "We must also call in the aid of Tradition, for it is impossible to find everything in Scripture, for the holy Apostles delivered to us some things in writing, and other things by Tradition" To the same effect we read in St. Basil, writing about the same time, the clear statement that the Church had Traditions on doctrinal questions, adding to what is contained in the Scripture Many passages to this effect are found in the Saint's work on the Holy Spirit, where he discusses the proper way of speaking of the Three Divine Persons Thus (n 66, *P.G* 32, 188)· "Among the dogmas that are maintained in the Church, we find some in the doctrinal writings, others come to us handed down from the Apostles, both of which have the same religious force" And again (n 71, p 200), he is advocating the use of a certain form of speech, and answers the argument that this form is not found in Scripture, as follows "If nothing else is accepted which is not Scriptural, then let not this be accepted, but if most of our doctrines are accepted among us without writing, then let us receive this along with the multitude of the rest" Patristic passages to the same effect have been collected in abundance.

108 *More necessary.*—It follows from what we have already said, that the Church could dispense

with Holy Scripture, but cannot dispense with Tradition Were it possible to imagine that all copies of the Scripture should perish, without possibility of restoration, still the voices of living men would proclaim what is the Christian teaching On the other hand, if a copy of the Bible found its way to some community who knew nothing of the Christian Revelation, there would be nothing about the volume by which it could be distinguished from other books teaching a sublime morality; the community would see no reason to take this Bible, and this Bible alone, as their religion. This superior necessity of Tradition plainly appears if we consider the way in which Protestants in fact learn their religion No one actually learns it from the Bible and the Bible alone All are taught by way of authority, however freely they may be referred to the Bible to verify what they are taught, if they fail to be convinced by the Scripture proofs, on such a matter as infant Baptism, for example, or the observation of Sunday, they will be told that wiser men than they have considered the matter and been convinced, and they will not be told that others have also considered the Scriptural argument and have found it insufficient, or more probably they will be led to stifle their own doubts out of respect to the usage of those among whom they have been brought up, and who have their confidence, they in fact believe Tradition, with which they could not dispense, the Scripture being a most valuable help, but not indispensable The high position that Catholic doctrine assigns to Holy

What will be seen in the next Treatise, and it will be seen that we yield to no Christians in our esteem, but we esteem it on account of what we learn concerning it from Tradition

109 *Recapitulation.*—This chapter has taught us that Tradition is prior in time to Scripture, and prior in thought, it is of wider scope, as is shown by several examples, and it is more necessary.

CHAPTER V.

DEVELOPMENT OF DOCTRINE.

110 *Subject of Chapter.*—It has been pointed out already (n. 19) that private revelations by God to man are always possible, and we hold that in fact they are given occasionally, even at the present day. In the present chapter we shall give our reasons for believing that no addition has been made to the body of doctrine which constitutes the Christian Revelation since the death of the last survivor among the Apostles, and further, that no new public revelation is to be looked for in the future. Also we shall explain the sense in which it may be admitted that continual growth is going on in our knowledge of Christian doctrine, and in doing this we shall freely assume points of doctrine which we have not yet established, for we bring them forward only as illustrating our subject.

111 *Heresies.*—Almost all Catholic writers agree in holding that the Divine scheme for undoing the work of the Fall and for raising mankind, and enabling them to attain to their supernatural last end was completed by the Death of our Redeemer and by the foundation of the Church But we read in the Gospel of St Matthew (xxiv. 24) the warning

given by our Lord that the time should come when there would arise false Christs and false prophets, and a solemn warning is given to us not to be misled. Nor has the event failed to show the truth of the prophecy and the necessity of the warning, in spite of which many have been led astray in every age of the Church. Preachers have arisen who have taught a Gospel besides that which was handed down by Tradition, and they have found men and women ready to neglect the warning given by St. Paul to the Galatians (i 8), and to listen to them. It will be enough to mention a few of those who have sought to supplement the Gospel that tells of the Word of God made Flesh for the redemption of man, by a new pretended Gospel of the Holy Spirit, as though there were to be a third dispensation under which the Third Person of the Holy Trinity completed the work which was begun under the Old Testament by the First Person, and was carried on by the Second Person in the New.

Among the number of these was one Montanus, who taught in the rude districts of Phrygia, in the latter part of the second century, and of whom we read in the words of an anonymous author quoted by Eusebius (*H E.* 5, 17; *P G* 20, 464), that he uttered strange sayings beyond the Tradition handed down from old times. Some of his followers, including two women, spoke as though carried away by the Holy Spirit and full of the gift of prophecy. Manes, the founder of that Manichean heresy which has been so deadly a foe to the Church, called

himself the Paraclete, and professed to know all things from all eternity (St Epiph *Hær* 66, n 19, *P G* 42, 57) The year 250 may be assigned as his date, and, to pass over many centuries, the pretended prophecies of the Abbot Joachim, who died in 1202, remained in credit for many years, in spite of the condemnation by the Fourth Council of Lateran in 1215 of the doctrine on the Blessed Trinity taught by their author, and new revelations were among the extravagances of the Fraticelli condemned by the Council at Vienne in 1311

Among the sects that sprang from the Reformation of the sixteenth century, similar delusions have been plentiful, it may suffice to mention Swedenborg, whose death occurred in 1772, who claimed to have direct illumination from God, not through Angel or Spirit, Irving, who believed that the marvels of the first Pentecost were renewed about the year 1830 among those who attended his ministry, and Smith, the American, who pretended that the Bible of the Western Continent was discovered to him in 1823, and who was murdered in 1844 The followers of this last are numerous enough and devoted enough to be a trouble to the Government of the United States, but it may be doubted whether the bond of union among them is not social and economical rather than any living belief in the revelation which their prophet professed to bring It is deserving of notice that the Catholic Church has been little troubled by ebullitions of this kind in recent times

112 *The Catholic Doctrine* —In opposition to all

these, the doctrine of Catholic theology is that the body of public revealed doctrine has received no objective increase since the days of the Apostles It is true, as St Thomas remarks, (*Summa Theol* 2. 2 q. 1. a 7. c) that the whole of the Divine economy of salvation is in some sense contained in the two fundamental articles which have been revealed from the beginning, that God is, and is a rewarder of them that seek Him. the explicit belief in which truths is and always has been a necessary condition of salvation, according to the doctrine of St Paul (Hebrews xi 6) But the whole body of Christian doctrine could never have been discovered as contained in this primitive and, so to speak, elementary revelation, had not further revelations been vouchsafed, and such revelations were given from time to time under the patriarchal dispensation, under the Mosaic Law, and during the life of Christ and His Apostles, also, the theologians of the Church continually discover, and will continue to discover, more and more of the fulness of meaning contained in these revelations, and from time to time the Church imprints the seal of her infallible approval upon their explicit statements of what was heretofore known implicitly alone, but we maintain that no substantially new revelation is given or will be given, to be proposed by the Church for the belief of the faithful

The proof is partly negative. There is no hint in the New Testament that any such new revelation is to be looked for Whatever prophecies or other indications of future events are met with, refer either

to the fortunes of the Church under the present dispensation (1 Timothy iv. 1), or more especially to the circumstances that will attend the Second Coming of our Lord, when the time of probation is over for all mankind and all receive the eternal reward of their works (St John xii. 48.) But there is not a word that can be represented as pointing to a time when the Church shall be replaced by another more perfect institution having the same object, and when means of grace will be granted to men more efficient than the Christian Sacraments In the Old Testament there are expressions which, taken by themselves, might seem to point to the perpetual duration of that institution (Genesis xvii 13, Numbers x. 8); but these do not necessarily imply that it shall not receive a more perfect form, and in fact many passages plainly point to its destiny to act as the slave, himself unlettered, that conducts a boy to the school where he will be taught (Galat iii 24) See, for instance, any of the well-known Messianic prophecies, such as Deut. xviii 15, where Moses warns the people of Israel that the time will come when his message will be spent and they will be called on to hear another prophet; and in the New Testament we see that Jewish priests and people looked forward to the coming crisis (St Matt ii 5, St John iv 25.)

The positive proof of our doctrine is derived directly from the Epistle to the Hebrews, throughout which St Paul insists on the transient character of the Synagogue as opposed to the perennial existence in store for the Church This meaning is

plain if the whole Epistle be read; but we may cite especially the verse (vii 27) where St Paul speaks of the translation of moveable things as made, that these things may remain which are immoveable and it is noticeable that the Apostle, addressing Jews, rests his teaching on an interpretation of two words in the prophecy of Aggeus (ii 7), and shows us the depths of meaning that may lurk in the minutest portions of the inspired text

That the Fathers did not believe that any new public revelation was possible, is plain from their constant habit of appealing to Tradition, as the one source of our knowledge of Christian truth. We may quote St. Irenæus (*Contra Hæreses*, 3, 1; *PG* 7, 844): "We know no other Gospel than what came to us from those that wrote the Scriptures For it cannot be said that they preached before they had full knowledge, as is boldly asserted by some who boast that they can improve upon the Apostles After the Resurrection of our Lord and the coming of the Holy Ghost, they had perfect knowledge and went forth to preach." Further examples of such passages are also given in nn 76, 77, 106.

113. *Progress of Theology*—But although there can be no objective increment in the public revelation committed to the custody of the Church, yet Theology is far from being a dead, unadvancing science; on the contrary, it makes constant advances The exact mode and form of this progression has varied in different ages of the Church, but it has never ceased. No serious-minded man

will suppose that the truths which it has pleased God to reveal contain no more than is apparent at the first glance, in fact, they are full of depths of meaning which are sounded only by those who bring to the task a variety of qualifications, intellectual and spiritual, which this is not the place to enumerate This labour results in glimpses being gained of truths that are implied in the monuments of the Tradition of the Church which had not hitherto been explicitly recognized and set forth Mistakes, no doubt, are made from time to time, theological students mistake the import of what is before them and draw erroneous conclusions, and it may even happen that they gain a considerable following But such an error will commonly soon die away of itself, or perhaps will be condemned by the supreme authority, but in some cases, the Holy See, in its prudence, allows the controversy to remain undecided, and in this way there are schools of theology within the Church, more or less opposed to each other, and well inclined to maintain their views, but all agreeing in readiness to submit to the decision of the Church, whenever the infallible voice is heard In this way an end was put in 431, by the Council of Ephesus, to the controversy concerning the exact mode of the union of the Divine and Human Natures in Christ, in 1854, Pope Pius IX terminated the long discussion concerning the Immaculate Conception of our Lady, and the Vatican Council of 1870, under the same Pope, finally established true doctrine as to the Primacy and Infallibility of the Successor of

St. Peter. All this will be better understood when the Treatise on the Church has been read

When speaking of the Canon of Scripture (n 152), we shall explain that there was a time when doubts existed within the Church as to the character of certain books of the Old Testament Before these doubts were raised, there had been a period of unreflecting acquiescence in a certain view: doubts founded on difficulties of the sort that are called critical, led to discussion: discussion resulted in the solution of these doubts, and in the explicit recognition of what had been implicitly held from the beginning; and when theological discussion had done its work, the Holy See gave the sanction of its authority to the truth, which thenceforward became an integral part of the defined faith which cannot be denied without loss of the name of Catholic. These three stages of implicit belief, doubt and controversy, and explicit avowal, sometimes followed by formal definition, may be recognized in the history of many points of doctrine. A superficial study of the history will sometimes suggest the idea that the doctrine was new when the first critical doubts were started; but in the course of the discussion it becomes clear that there is nothing new in the substance of the doctrine, but only in the mode of statement. These three stages are all seen in the cases of Baptism by heretics, of the Real Presence, and of the Immaculate Conception, but in no instance better than in the controversy concerning the Canon of Scripture

114 *The Vincentian Canon* —The explanation just given serves to remove the difficulty which is sometimes felt in understanding how the Catholic Church can be said to be unchanging in faith at the same time that cases are easily produced where a matter which was not a defined doctrine at one date, subsequently comes to be defined This is no more a change than it is a change for the germ that is in a seed to unfold and become a tree It is no change of doctrine when that which has always been held implicitly, becomes the subject of an explicit declaration There would be change if the Church of one age taught as of faith, what had not been held in any sense in a previous age, still more, if it taught the contradictory of what had been previously held but neither of these cases has occurred, as we shall see from time to time, as we treat particular doctrines

The reader will now understand the sense in which we may accept the principle laid down by Vincent of Lerins in a well-known passage, which is called from him the Vincentian Canon This Vincent was a monk who received his surname from his residence at Lerins, an island in the Mediterranean, off the south coast of France He lived in the first half of the fifth century The canon in question occurs in the second chapter of his work called *Commonitorium* (*P L* 50, 640), and runs as follows "In the Catholic Church we must with all care hold that which has been held *in all places, at all times, by all men*, for this is truly and properly Catholic" *Commonitorium* is the name given

to a work having for its full title, "A Warning against the Profane Novelties of all Heresies," and this title sufficiently describes its character. Directed especially against certain heresies that concerned the Word of God, and His union with Human Nature in Christ—Arian, Nestorian, and others—its argument is by no means confined to these forms of error, but extends to every form of doctrine that is not the doctrine of the Catholic Church: if once a doctrine can be shown to have been received as part of the deposit of faith in all places, at all times, and by all men, then this doctrine is assuredly part of the Catholic faith, and whatever is opposed to it is error; and this principle is as true now as it was fourteen centuries ago, and it leads us at once to reject whatever teaching is out of accord with the teaching of Ephesus in 431, or with the Vatican Council in 1870. And it is clear that Vincent did not mean more when he laid down his canon, he did not mean that what has at some time been denied by Catholic theologians cannot be part of the faith; for he himself points out (c. 6, p. 646) that the Saint and Martyr Cyprian fell into error in denying the validity of Baptism administered by heretics, a point which had not been definitely decided by the Church, and his error gave occasion to a letter of Pope St Stephen, who, quoting the great principle that no novelties were to be introduced which Tradition did not teach, finally settled the controversy.

115 *Recapitulation*.—In this chapter which has been mainly historical, and which has been illustrated

by reference to sundry points of Catholic doctrine which will be fully explained hereafter, we have seen that the prophecy read in the Gospel, that false Christs shall arise and false prophets, has had its fulfilment in all ages of the Church Then we saw the grounds of our belief that the public revelation of God was closed in the days of the Apostles, and that no new economy of salvation is to be expected in succession to the Catholic Church, it was then pointed out that the labour of theologians upon the deposit was continually bringing out and exhibiting explicitly successive portions of truth which up to that time had not been known except implicitly; and finally the sense of the Vincentian Canon was explained, and thus the Treatise on Tradition was brought to a close.

Treatise the Third.

Holy Scripture.

CHAPTER I.

WHAT IS MEANT BY "SCRIPTURE."

116. *Plan of Treatise.*—We have already on many occasions quoted the Holy Scripture, sometimes treating its authority as decisive on the questions which we have discussed, and often using it in such a manner as implies that a special authority belongs to these Books, such as no other books can claim to possess. Yet we have so far not given any reason for holding this, and, in fact, we have deviated slightly from logical order, anticipating matter which was yet to come. No other course could be adopted without a serious sacrifice of convenience to merely formal accuracy, and the present Treatise will justify the assumptions that we have made. Something similar will be met with in other parts of Theology, the science forms one organic whole, each part ramifying so as to become connected with other parts, so that there are no sharp divisions, every arrangement into Treatises is necessarily to some extent arbitrary and artificial;

these divisions are needed by the learner, but he cannot expect to understand any part thoroughly until he has studied other portions which deal with kindred matter

117 *Subject of Chapter* —It will be found that there are three classes of occasions on which we have used the authority of the Scripture In our first Treatise, we used the Gospels and some of the Epistles of St Paul, along with the Annals of Tacitus, the Letters of Pliny, and other materials, as ancient documents which gave a trustworthy account of the miracles of Christ and other circumstances which established the Divine Mission of the Worker of these miracles, and conveyed to us some knowledge of His teaching. So far the Scripture was treated as if it were a purely human work, and we could not expect that those who did not admit our doctrine should treat it in any other manner But our second Treatise dealt with opponents who are as ready as ourselves to admit the decisive authority of Scripture, except that they do not altogether agree with us in drawing up the list of Books to which the Scriptural character belongs, and, therefore, as long as we avoided the disputed Books, we were at liberty to use the rest as authorities in the controversy on which we were engaged, accordingly, we employed the Epistles of St Paul to St Timothy, which we could not have quoted in our first Treatise without entering on a discussion of their genuineness, for questions have been raised whether they are the work of St Paul, and it would have been inconvenient and needless to delay in

order to settle the point In this polemical matter, therefore, our argument is partly *ad hominem* But throughout both Treatises we have done something towards showing how the Catholic doctrine is contained in the monuments of Tradition, and this, as we have seen, is part of the work of a theologian (n 84); and it is here, if anywhere, that we have slightly anticipated what will be proved in the present Treatise

This first chapter will be devoted to giving some account of the Books that constitute the Holy Scripture

118 "*Scripture*" "*Bible*"—There is a collection, or rather series of Books which are now, and have long been, held in special honour among Christians, and a portion of which are now, and have long been, held in special honour by the Jews and these Books we mean when we speak of Scripture Those Books of Scripture which relate to the centuries before the Birth of Christ, form the Old Testament, from which the New Testament is distinguished. It is usual to bind these Books together into one volume, and this volume is called the Bible We shall see in our next chapter that there are other names by which these Books have been known; and we shall there see that besides there being names applied to the Books as a whole, there is much else that can be said about them in common; but at present we shall point out various respects in which they do *not* agree, and in this way we shall obviate by anticipation many mistakes that are rife as to their true character

119 *Date of Composition* —Whatever doubts there may be as to the date of the composition of particular Books of Scripture, the discussion of which does not belong to Theology, but must be sought in the Introduction to the various Books, it is certain that many centuries elapsed between the earliest and the latest The earliest Books we believe to date from 1400 years before Christ, being the first five Books, collectively called the Pentateuch, or five volumes, the work of Moses, the latest is commonly reckoned to be the Gospel of St John, the date of which is perhaps not much earlier than 100 after Christ

120 *Original Languages.* — Various languages were employed for the originals of the Scripture The greater part of the Old Testament was written in Hebrew, which was and is the proper language of the Israelites, and was therefore naturally employed by writers who addressed themselves primarily to Israelites For certain portions, however, a kindred language was employed, which is called Chaldee or Syriac This is the language which was in use on the east of the Euphrates, in the country to which the Jews were carried as captives by King Nabuchodonosor, about 600 years before Christ (2 Paral xxxvi 20), and Daniel, who was among the captives, employed it for part of his Book It first occurs in the fourth verse of the second chapter "And the Chaldeans answered the King in Syriac, O King, live for ever." Down to the word *Syriac*, all is Hebrew, but *O King* is Chaldee, and the same language is employed up to the seventh chapter,

Hebrew is resumed at the beginning of the eighth. It is natural to suppose that the words, *O King*, &c., are given in the language in which they were originally spoken, but there is no apparent reason why the same language is retained in what follows, nor why, after a while, the use of Hebrew is resumed Something similar is found in the First Book of Esdras, which is concerned with affairs immediately after the Captivity, where two passages, iv 8, vi. 18, and again, vii 12—26, are in Chaldaic The latter of these is a letter of King Artaxerxes, given doubtless in its original language; the former also opens with a citation, although it goes on to other matter. There is another instance (Jerem x. 11), where the Prophet puts some words into the mouth of his hearers, and as early as Genesis xxxi 47, it is remarked that the language of Jacob, the Hebrew, was different from that of Laban, who dwelt in the east country (Genesis xxix 1) The use of the name Chaldee for the language here spoken of is thoroughly established and will not mislead, although it originated in an error, and is regarded as absurd by Semitic scholars. (Wright, *Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages*, p 16) This tongue is very nearly, but not quite, identical with what is commonly called Syriac

A large part of the Old Testament is still extant in the original Hebrew or Chaldaic, and this part constitutes the whole of what is recognized by the Jews, whom the Protestants follow Besides these, the Tradition of the Church recognizes two Books

of Greek origin, and five Books which seem to have been written originally in Hebrew, although they are now extant only in a Greek translation, as is the case also with large parts of the Books of Daniel and Esther These seven, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, Tobias, Judith, and the First of Machabees, together with Wisdom and the Second Machabees, are called deuterocanonical Books, for reasons which will be explained in our fourth chapter of this Treatise, where their claim to be considered part of Scripture will be established. The Protestants, who reject them, brand them with the name of Apocrypha

Probably the whole of the New Testament was written in Greek There is some doubt whether the Gospel of St Matthew and the Epistle to the Hebrews may not have had a Hebrew origin, but however this may be, nothing is now in existence which is prior to the Greek of these two Books, from which all the versions are derived

121 *Writers*—Many of the Books of Scripture are anonymous, nor has tradition preserved the name of the writer, such are the later Books of Kings, the Paralipomena, the Machabees, and Job. Others are believed, with more or less certainty, to have been written by the leading men whose actions they relate, Moses, for instance, and Samuel. Many of the Psalms were written by David, but not all, and it is to be remarked that the superscriptions or "titles" prefixed to a large proportion of the Psalms, are perhaps no part of the inspired Scripture The three Books of Proverbs, the

Preacher, and the Song of Songs, with the possible exception of a part of the first named (see Cornely's *Introductions*), were written by Solomon, but the same cannot be said of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus, which deal with a somewhat similar argument The Books of the Prophets were probably put together each by him whose name it bears, or by his immediate disciples; but it must be carefully remembered that the prophetic gift itself was something different from the commission to write a Book; thus Elias, one of the greatest of the Prophets, seems to have written nothing

The whole of the New Testament was written by Apostles, except the Gospels of St Mark and St. Luke, which are taken to represent the teaching of St Peter and St Paul respectively (St Iren *Contra Hæreses*, 3, 1; *P G.* 7, 845, Euseb *Hist. Eccl* 3, 34; *P.G.* 20, 300, quoting Papias)

122 *Extent*—The Books of Scripture are of very various extent. Genesis contains fifty chapters, the Prophecy of Isaias sixty-six On the other hand, the Epistle to Philemon, the second and third of St John, and that of St Jude, are confined to a single chapter each. The number of chapters indicates roughly the extent of the Book The division into chapters does not come from the original authors, being, in fact, no older than the thirteenth century after Christ, and due either to Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury (1227), or to the Dominican Cardinal Hugh à Sancto Caro (1262). The verses were first numbered in a Paris edition of the Vulgate (1548) On these

and other divisions of the Scriptures, see Cornely, *Introductio*, I 35

123 *Style*—Nor is there less variety in the literary style Thus we have bald narration in 2 Paral xvi 1—5, in 1 Mach xiv 4—15, the narrative is more ornate A good specimen of the gnomic style is found in Prov x 1—5, and in Wisdom xiii 11—19, there is close philosophical reasoning Poetry is abundant, and the 83rd Psalm, *Quam dilecta*, may be cited as a convenient specimen; and the use of symbols instead of speech is found in Ezech x throughout

124 *Matter*—The matter of these Books is as various as the style, which is in fact accommodated to it In general terms we may say that the Old Testament gives us the history of the Creation and Flood, and of the Israelite and Jewish nation down to the year 135 before Christ. But this history is treated mainly with the view of illustrating the providence of God in dealing with this chosen nation, hence there are long intervals in which nothing is recorded, and we may suppose that nothing occurred that bore upon this subject Besides this history, we have some narrations instructing us in piety, such as the stories of Ruth and Tobit, there is direct moral teaching in the Book of Proverbs and elsewhere, the Books of the Prophets contain exhortations, and in the Psalms we have examples showing us how we ought to praise God and pray to Him

In the New Testament we have the history of the Life and Death of Christ and some account of the

actions of the Apostles; there are letters of instruction and exhortation, and one letter to Philemon on a private subject; and lastly, the Apocalypse, with the account of the revelations vouchsafed to St John, which closes the whole series

125. *Recapitulation*.—This enumeration of the various characters of the Books of Scripture makes it clear that they have no internal bond of connection; the unity which undoubtedly belongs to the collection must be sought in something that is external to its members We have shown that it is not found in the date, language, writers, bulk, style, nor matter. We proceed in the next chapter to search for it in something external.

CHAPTER II

THE SPECIAL CHARACTER OF SCRIPTURE.

126 *Subject of Chapter* —In this chapter we shall show that Jews and heathens have agreed with Christians in recognizing that a peculiar character attaches to the Books that we call Scripture This is shown by the zeal of the heathen for the destruction of these Books, and by the care of believers for their preservation, as also by the laborious study of their contents and by the decisive authority attributed to them

127 *Names given to Scripture* —We have now to see what there is that belongs in common to all the Books of which we have hitherto spoken under the name of Scripture or Scriptures This name itself occurs some fifty times in the New Testament, to denote the writings that make up the Old Testament. Examples will be found in St Matt xxi 42, xxii 29, St. John ii 22, Acts i 19, Romans i 2, i St Peter ii 6. This word means simply Writings In 2 Timothy iii 15, another word is employed both in the Greek and in the Latin (*τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα, sacræ literæ*, instead of *ἡ γραφή*, or *ἅγιαι γραφαί, scriptura*), but the sense is the same Various reasons have been found for these books being called Holy:

they come from the Spirit of Holiness, the matter they teach is holy, and it makes holy those who are guided by it Other names are, the Book of the Lord (Isaias xxxiv 16), and the Book of the Law of God. (2 Esdras viii 8) The word Bible is nothing but the Greek word, *βίβλια*, meaning "Books" St Jerome, and others in imitation of him, use *Bibliotheca*, which is properly Library It occurs in a gossiping letter on literary subjects (Epist 5 *al* 6, *ad Florentium*, *P L* 22, 336), numerous examples from later writers will be found in Ducange, *Gloss Med et Inf. Latin* s v.

The word Testament which we apply to the two collections, Old and New, properly signifies the last will, which is to take effect after the death of him that made it, and St. Paul uses it in this sense, and founds an argument upon the mutable nature which it retains so long as the testator lives (Hebrews ix. 15—17) But the same word is used in the Vulgate in the sense of "covenant" (St Matt xxvi 28), where it represents the *διαθήκη* of the Septuagint, which Greek word is elsewhere translated *fœdus*, or covenant, in the Vulgate. (Exodus xxiv 7) From "covenant" to "instrument testifying to a covenant," the transition is easy, and this explains our English use of the word Testament for the collection of Books which contain the particulars of the covenant entered into by God, first with the Israelitish nation, and then with the Christian people Tertullian uses Instrument in the same sense See, for instance, *Adv Marcionem*, 4, 1, *P.L.* 2, 361

The name Canonical Book will be more con-

veniently explained in the fourth chapter of this Treatise (n 148)

128 *Mode of citation* —A peculiar form is used whenever one of these Books is cited in another. "It is written," is the formula in the Synoptic Gospels and St Paul (St Matt iv 4, Romans i 17), and the slightly different form of the verb employed by St John (*γεγραμμένον ἐστίν*, instead of *γέγραπται*) can scarcely be distinguished in translation (St John ii 17) From the New Testament the same usage passed to the Fathers, so that when any early writer employs this formula in citing a Book, we have an accepted proof that he regarded this Book as forming a part of the Holy Scriptures Much is made of this text by writers on the Canon, and we shall have occasion to employ it in our chapter on the subject

129 *Decisiveness* —It may be observed that when a Book of Scripture is cited, it is treated as a decisive authority, against which there is no appeal. A good instance is seen in the narrative of the Temptation of our Lord (St Matt iv 4, St Luke iv 4), but the examples are very frequent, such as Acts xxiii 5, Romans xiv 11. Naturally, the Scriptures are not quoted in discourses addressed to the heathen, but Jews and Christians alike admitted their authority as decisive

130 *Manuscripts and Versions* —It will be sufficient to remind the reader of what was said in our first Treatise (nn. 49, 50), concerning the multitude of manuscripts of the Scriptures, in a great variety of languages This evidence of care suffices to show

the esteem in which these Books were held, far above any other writings

131. *Laborious Study* —The same high esteem for these books above all other books is shown by the diligence with which they were studied They were constantly read in the assemblies of Christians, and were the basis of argument and exhortation And to this use corresponded the assiduous toil at their study and interpretation which occupied so large a part of the lives of the great writers of the Church, with results of which their works are full No books approach these of which we are speaking in the number of commentaries which have been written upon them, and men of the highest intellectual ability, such as St Augustine, have thought their time well spent in searching out the meaning of each phrase of this text, a labour which they would have disdained to employ in the case of any other book The result has been that in all Catholic countries the minds of men are filled with the phraseology of the Holy Scripture, and the more so in proportion as religion flourishes among them, and they find this familiarity to be perfectly consistent with a dutiful submission to the teaching of the Church The men who lived in those centuries which are sometimes called the "Dark Ages" and sometimes the "Ages of Faith," were certainly not lacking in the spirit of humble acceptance of whatever came to them by the tradition of the Church, yet their minds were altogether saturated with Holy Scripture, as will be easily seen by any one who, being himself familiar with the version in use in those days, will

study a page of their writings with the view of noting the ideas and phrases that are borrowed from the Scripture

132 *Esteemed by the Jews* —The esteem in which the Scriptures were held by the Jews is testified by the care with which the Hebrew copies were made, as may be seen in any book on the usages of the people It is proved too by the elaborate machinery of points and accents by which their learned men strove, with dubious success, to keep alive the traditional pronunciation They preserved the text with sacred care, and for this object they went through the labour of counting the verses in each book and noting which verse held the middle place And a still stronger proof of their almost excessive reverence for the letter is found in this, that they invented an immense science, called the Cabbala, which set about the task of deducing secret meanings from the numerical value of the letters composing a word. In the Hebrew, as in many other alphabets, each letter represents a number, and the numerical value of a word is that obtained by adding together the numerical values of the letters. The fundamental principle of the Cabbalistic science was that when two words had the same numerical value, their meanings must have some secret connection which it was the business of the student to discover. It was pretended, without an atom of proof, that the bases of this science had been revealed to Moses, and the knowledge of them was handed down by secret tradition Of course, in skilful hands it led to very remarkable results, but

its only interest to us lies in the fact that it proves how thoroughly the Jews were imbued with the conviction that the Books of Scripture were in some way different from all other books

Their reverence, carried to such excess, raises a presumption that they did not tamper with the text, and it is certain that they have not done so In proof, we must distinguish the time that went before the preaching of Christ and His Apostles from the years that followed. For the first period the proof is negative, there is no trace of any such corruptions, although the Old Testament contains much matter which redounds to the discredit of the Israelitish nation and in the New Testament nothing of the sort is laid to the charge of the Jews, but they are congratulated on the honour of being custodians of the words of God (Romans iii. 2). for the second period, we have positive proof, for the Greek, Latin, and Syriac versions were in the hands of the Christians; and comparing these with the Hebrew text as preserved by the Jews, we find substantial identity, and in particular the great Messianic prophecies are read in the Hebrew as clearly as in those copies which the Gentiles used. The innocence of the Jews in this respect seems to be established beyond doubt, nevertheless, it is no great matter of surprise that the charge of corrupting the Scriptures was made against them References to several authors of ancient and comparatively modern times, who have made the charge, will be found in Cornely's *Introduction*, i. 270. Some of these passages do not seem to impute corruption of

the text, but unfair translation under the influence of what would now be called dogmatic prejudice. as when *damsel* is put instead of *virgin* in Isaias vii 14 (St Irenæus, c *Hær* 3, 21, *P G* 7, 946.) St Justin Martyr (c *Tryphon* 71, *P G* 6, 641) speaks of authorities existing in the Books which the Jews *still* hold to, implying that he believed them to have suppressed some Books Tertullian says roundly that the Jews reject almost all passages that speak of Christ (*De Cultu Feminarum*, 3, *P L* 1, 1308), and Origen accuses them of keeping and issuing garbled copies for the use of the people, while their learned men had perfect copies for their own use (*Epist ad Africanum*, 9, *P G*. 11, 65) These accusations seem to have been baseless they were due to mistakes which are excusable when we remember the difficulty which was experienced in procuring correct copies St Jerome (*In Isaiam* 3, 7, *P L* 24, 99) quotes Origen as defending the Jews against these charges by pretty much the same arguments as we used above, and St Augustine (*De Civit Dei*, 15, 13; *P L* 41, 452) makes the remark that if the copies of the Hebrew used by the Jews throughout the world are found to differ from the Septuagint, it is most probable that this last is in error, for a mistake made accidentally in an early transcript of the Greek may well have been transmitted, but it would have been impossible to alter the multitude of Hebrew copies in all countries of East and West

133 *Heretics and Heathens* —We have a further proof of the special esteem in which these books were held in early times, as a sign that they were

believed to differ essentially from all other books, in the use made of them by heretics, who sometimes rejected particular Books of Scripture or added to the list, but who never ventured to deny the authority of the collection as a whole the only exception being perhaps the case of those sects who regarded the Old Testament as the utterance of a Being inferior to the God of the New Testament, or perhaps opposed to Him but even these acknowledged the Old Testament as not being a merely human utterance. And lastly, the same point is illustrated by the course adopted by the Emperor Diocletian in 303, when he began his final attempt to suppress the Christian religion, and ordered that the Sacred Books should be delivered up to be burnt (Eusebius, *H E.* 3, 2, *P G* 20, 745) God's providence watched over the preservation of the precious deposit that He had committed to His Church, and the Emperor's will was not carried out to the full nevertheless, a large number of the then existing copies were destroyed, and this may be the reason why no fragment has survived which can be supposed to have been written before the fourth century To deliver up the Scriptures to the emissaries of the Government was esteemed a form of apostasy. up to this time three classes of *Lapsi* had been recognized, the *Sacrificati*, who had actually sacrificed, the *Thurificati*, who had offered incense to the idols and the *Libellatici*, who procured by bribery a false certificate that they had complied with the law the fourth class, who had delivered up the books, were called *Traditores*. (See

St Augustine, *De Baptismo contra Donatum*, lib 7, c 2, n 3) The accusation of being Traditores, or of having communion with them, and being thus partakers in their guilt, was freely handed to and fro in the beginning of the Donatist controversy

134 *Recapitulation* —In this chapter we have illustrated the truth that a special character was believed to belong to the Books of Holy Scripture as shown by the names given to the collection, by the mode in which they were cited and their decisive authority, by the care taken in multiplying copies and versions and in studying them, and by the conduct of the Jews, Heretics, and Heathen, in their regard.

CHAPTER III.

INSPIRATION OF SCRIPTURE.

135 *Subject of the Chapter*.—The two preceding chapters have shown us that the Books of Holy Scripture form a class apart from all others, and that the common character which thus distinguishes them is not found in anything internal to the books We must now inquire what truly is the common character, and we shall find it in the truth that these books are the works of one and the same Author, and this Author is God The present and two following chapters differ from the earlier chapters of this Treatise in being dogmatic, whereas the others were chiefly either historical or depended on simple inspection of the Bible In our present discussion we shall use the truths that have already been established that Christ being a Divine Messenger, all His utterances and those of all who spoke with His authority must be accepted without reserve: that the Books of the New Testament contain an historically credible account of some of these utterances· and that a knowledge of these utterances, so far as they concern us, is preserved by tradition among the followers of Christ, as was proved in our second Treatise, by arguments still

founded on the Scripture considered as a human history The Divine authorship of the Scripture will be established in the present chapter, and thenceforward all arguments drawn from Scripture will have a higher importance as being founded on the Word of God Himself

136 *Doctrine of the Church*—In the present chapter we speak of the Scripture in general terms, embracing in the word the Old Testament and the New, but not as yet entering on the controverted question, as to what Books constitute the collection, a question which will occupy us in the next chapter, on the Canon of Scripture. Subject to this remark, we may say that the doctrine of the present chapter is not substantially questioned by any prominent school of writers among those who cordially maintain the supernatural character of Christianity Those who see in Christianity nothing but a product of the natural powers of the human mind cannot consistently admit the inspiration of Scripture, in the sense in which the expression has always been used, and they endeavour to attach a new sense to the word *inspiration*, for they do not venture to reject this word, we shall discuss their new meanings and show their insufficiency, when we have established our own doctrine (n 144)

The system of doctrines and principles which has existed in various forms and which goes under the name of Manicheism, was for many centuries one of the chief opponents with whom the Church had to contend A leading idea among the Mani-

cheans was the intrinsically evil nature of matter, which they believed to owe its existence to a Being who was not the Supreme God, but a rival to Him. But the God of the Old Testament proclaims Himself the Creator of matter, wherefore, most Manichean sects rejected the authority of these Books, and accepted the New Testament alone, and they were forced to tamper even with this. In opposition to this error, the Church insisted on the truth that the Old and New Testaments came from the same God, and expressed this by saying that the same God was Author of both a way of speaking which assured us not merely that the two Testaments are not contrary, one to the other, but that their harmonious agreement was a result of Divine *authorship* And since these definitions cannot lead us astray, as was established in our Treatise on Tradition and will be more fully explained when we speak of the Church in our next Treatise, it follows that the form of expression used assures us of more than the point which was immediately before the minds of those that used it the form in which they expressed themselves on the two Testaments disclosed their mind as to the common character of both.

A venerable expression of the truth is found in the Roman Pontifical, in the Order for the Consecration of Bishops The candidate is interrogated as to his faith, in a form which was in use as long ago as the middle of the eleventh century (Denzinger, *Enchir* xxxix), and among the rest he avows his belief that there is one Author of the New and Old

Testaments, the Law, Prophets, and Apostles, the Almighty God and Lord In 1439, Pope Eugenius IV, in the Council of Florence, taught the same doctrine, with the addition of the reason For the Saints of both Testaments spoke under the inspiration of the same Holy Spirit, and he pronounced an anathema on the madness of the Manicheans who said that one God was the God of the New Testament, and another of the Old (Denz 600.) The Council of Trent, in its fourth Session (1546), is content to mention parenthetically that one God is Author of both Testaments, the Vatican Council of 1870 (*Constitut* 1ma c 2) teaches that the Books of Holy Scripture having been written under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, have God for their Author (Denz 1636)

137 *The Teaching of Christ*—We learn the teaching of Christ Himself upon this matter in two ways by His not correcting the belief held by the Jews, and by His own way of speaking There are two contemporary Jewish writers, from whom we learn the views current among that people at the time, Philo and Josephus, and their testimony is the more valuable, because they give it in a merely incidental manner, as assuming something in which all readers would agree, and not as distinctly maintaining a doctrine which might be peculiar to themselves It will be sufficient to quote a single passage from each Philo quotes the law as to Cities of Refuge, given by God through Moses (Exodus xxi. 12), and he is embarrassed by observing what he considers to be a superfluous word Shall die *the*

death? Would it not be sufficient to say *Shall die?* Philo is, he says, at a loss, for he was sure that the Lawgiver would not have inserted a redundant word (*De Profugis*, § 10, vol 3, p 121 of Leipsig Edition of 1828) Whatever else we may think of the passage, it at least shows clearly that Philo regarded God as the Author of the Scriptures, and responsible for the minutest details of the text Josephus takes the same view when he says (*Contra Apion* 1, 7) that the Prophets wrote things as they learned them from God by inspiration, and he gives the name of Prophets to all the writers of the Old Testament.

Our Lord Himself considered that which is related in the Scripture as having been said by God, for He treats the history of the apparition to Moses in the burning bush (Exodus iii 6) as being spoken by God to the Sadducees of His own time (St Matt xxii 31), which could not be unless God still spoke in the pages of His Book. As long as a book survives, an author speaks to his readers. but he does not speak in the pages of another

138 *Doctrine of the Apostles* —The teaching of the Apostles is in perfect accord In Acts i 16, St Peter quotes the Scripture which the Holy Ghost spoke by the mouth of David In Hebrews iv. 3—9, God is repeatedly treated as speaking by the Scriptures, and in Galat iii 8, the gift of foresight is ascribed to the Scripture, not surely to the material Book, but to its Author, the all-foreseeing God.

139 *The Fathers* —Among a multitude of Patristic passages, we may be content with two, one

derived from the East, the other from the West St Chrysostom (Hom 2, *in Gen* n 2, *PG* 53, 23) says that God, wishing to put an end to a temporary estrangement, has sent letters to His absent friends, letters written by God and brought us by Moses And St Augustine sets forth God's authorship and the subordinate part played by the human writer in the following forcible manner "All that God wished us to know concerning His doings and sayings, He bade be written by man, as by His own hands" (*De Consens Evangel* I. c 35, n 54, *PG* 34, 1070) There is no need to multiply citations, for the point is not disputed

140 *Man's part The Intellect*—But although what has been said affords complete proof of the doctrine of the Church, that God is the Author of the Holy Scripture, yet this must not be understood as if the human writer had no part in the work This is plain if we consider the literary style of each Book, which is found to be in accord with the character of the human writer, or at least different from that found in the works of different writers Critics will find many differences of style in the Epistles of St Paul, St James, and St Peter; in the Prophecies of Isaias and Amos; in the Psalms of David and those of Asaph. These differences are most naturally accounted for, by supposing that each human writer wrote according to his natural disposition and circumstances, in such style as he would have employed in a work which was completely his own, the only alternative is to suppose that the Holy Spirit, for no visible purpose, imitated

the style of the man whom He employed as His secretary, to write from His dictation, an arbitrary supposition which has nothing to recommend it: when natural agency is sufficient to bring about a result, there is no reason to invoke supernatural influence.

At the same time, the Divine Authorship will not be preserved unless we attribute to the Holy Spirit the largest and most important part in the work of composition, the human writer is in the position of a secretary to the true Author of the letter If we consider the relation between a secretary and him for whom he acts, we can see something of the nature of the Divine influence which is called inspiration In the first place, a secretary will not do his work properly unless he be accurately informed on the subject of his discourse; in technical language, his intellect must be illuminated. It is immaterial whether we suppose the employer himself to impart the needful information to his secretary, or to put him in the way to gather it for himself, or whether he choose for the work one who is already fully informed In like manner, God sometimes by His own direct action, revealed to the holy writers what He would have them write; as when the Prophets wrote their visions, and the Apostles and Evangelists wrote the things that they had seen and heard (Acts iv 20) Sometimes the writer gathered his information from the best sources open to him, as when the unknown person who put together the Second Book of Machabees found that he had taken in hand no easy task in

abridging the five books of Jason of Cyrene (2 Mach. ii 24—33), he here speaks as any purely human writer might do, and the passage is sometimes made a ground for denying the inspiration of the Book, but in reality nothing more is here said than we find in St Luke's preface to his Gospel, who tells us of his diligence in inquiring at the best sources (St Luke i 1—4), nor more than is implied in the references to the Book of the Just made by the writer of the Book of Josue (x 13) and of the Second Book of Kings (i 18), which references involved a certain labour, so that if the right of the Books of Machabees to be considered a part of Scripture is denied on this ground, the Old and New Testaments must be rejected with them

Cases where a Book was written in the light of the information which the writer already possesses from natural sources, without special research, are found in the Epistles, and also apparently in the instance of Genesis Moses would seem to have put into writing the traditions that had been preserved, perhaps in writing or perhaps in the memory of the people, and it is probable that the young children were taught the story by their parents, in the way in which it was ordered that the remembrance of the deliverance from Egypt should be kept alive (Exodus xii 26, 27) The history of the Creation cannot have been known except by revelation, but there is no reason to suppose that this revelation was made to Moses. More probably it was made to Adam, and became known to Moses through human sources When

we speak thus of the history having come down to Moses by tradition, we do not mean to imply that there was any special guarantee that the whole of this traditional history should be preserved free from corruption, the case is not like that of the Tradition by which the knowledge of the Christian Revelation is preserved, free from admixture of error, in the Church; it is enough that God's providence preserved Moses from being misled by any errors that may have crept into the current account.

141. *Man's part. The will*—It is not enough that the employer should take care that his secretary should be acquainted with the matter If the secretary, of his own accord, and without being commissioned to do so, writes a treatise, this work is his own, and the employer cannot be said to be the author. The design must come from the author, and he must stir up his assistant to induce him to do his part, technically, he must inflame the will. The impulse to write must then have come to the inspired writers from God, for otherwise God could not be said to be the Author of the sacred Books. It follows that there is no reason to suppose that all that the Apostles committed to writing was inspired, even though, as we shall see hereafter, the Apostolate involved the privilege of inerrancy in matters of faith and morals An Apostle may have written on indifferent subjects without being inspired; and they may even have written doctrinal treatises in the exercise of the natural powers of their will, without any special motion from God. It is even possible, for aught that we see, that they should at

one time have written under inspiration and at another time not under inspiration, without being aware of the difference; it is, however, highly improbable that they ever wrote without knowing well the nature of the task on which they were engaged, and the influence under which they undertook it

142 *Supervision*.—Lastly, before the employer finally adopts the secretary's work as his own, he must be careful to use such supervision as shall exclude all risk of matter having crept in for which he would not wish to make himself responsible, he must guard himself against the results of the mistakes or unfaithfulness of his servant In the case of Holy Scripture we need not think of this as having required what we should conceive as being a distinct act of God, but it must have been involved in the illumination of the intellect and inflaming of the will, otherwise the work which is ascribed to the Divine Author would be liable to all the imperfections of the works of man

This supervision, however, is far from being necessarily equivalent to dictation If two secretaries write letters in the manner that has been described, each letter may well express the views of the principal, and may be adopted and signed by him, and so made his own, yet a competent person would easily see that there was a difference of style between the two In the same way it is not difficult to distinguish those parts of the Scripture where St Matthew played the part of secretary from those which we owe to St. John The

works are distinguishable in style, although they belong to the same Author Who stirred the writer to undertake the task, secured him the requisite knowledge, and superintended the work while it was in progress

143. *Verbal Inspiration* —Our doctrine is opposed to that which goes by the name of Verbal Inspiration, according to which every word of Scripture was as it were dictated by the Holy Spirit to the Prophets and Apostles, so that they acted as mere machines The doctrine of Verbal Inspiration preserves the Divine Authorship to the full, to a greater fulness, in fact, than is needed It is therefore unproved, and it is open to the grave objection that it fails to account for the varieties of style of which we have spoken In regard to style, the Books of Scripture exhibit the same variety as might be expected in purely human books, but if each word was dictated by the Holy Spirit, there is no way of accounting for these varieties, they would seem to have been introduced for no other purpose than that of misleading the reader. There are cases where there may be room for doubt whether a particular turn of phrase was "intended" by the Holy Spirit—so far as this word can be used of God, to Whom all the results of His acts are known; in these cases it is the business of the critic to determine what teaching is contained in the passage; the question is often very subtle, and should not be approached except by those who feel themselves to be well equipped with the full array of necessary qualifications, among which we put in the front

rank, thorough grounding in the theology of the Church, long familiarity with the Sacred Text, and the disposition to be ready to accept the truth from another rather than devise a novel view In some cases the Author has Himself pointed out that a true meaning is conveyed by what might otherwise have been judged to be a casual omission, a notable instance of which we find in Hebrews vii 3, where we read why it is that in Genesis xiv 18, when Melchisedech is mentioned, the names of his parents are not made known.

144 *False views of Inspiration* —It having been proved that the Books of Holy Scripture have God for their Author, and that this character marks them off from all other books, certain false views of the nature of inspiration fall of themselves Two errors are noted and condemned by the Vatican Council (Constit I cap 2, *De Revelatione*, Denz. 1636), one makes the essence of inspiration consist in adoption by the Church, even where the book so adopted had a purely human origin, whereas it is impossible for a book which is once written to change its author, the other view considers that it is enough that they contain Revelation without admixture of error; whereas this may be said of the "Capitula" of the Councils of Trent and the Vatican the professor may watch over the student's work in such way as to secure him from committing himself to error, but without interfering with the authorship of his treatise The word "inspiration" is sometimes used of the faculty that enables a man to write a book which stirs up religious emotions,

but this is plainly not a character belonging to the whole Bible, as will be seen if the First Book of Paralipomena is read; nor is it confined to the Bible, for it is found also in such works as the *Imitation of Christ*, it therefore is not the sense in which the word Inspiration is used by the Church The Church usage originates with St. Paul, who wrote to St. Timothy that all Scripture, inspired by God, is profitable to teach; it expresses the peculiar and definite character of Divine Authorship; and confusion is bred if it be used in any other sense.

145. *Freedom from Error.*—From the character of an author we judge the character of his book If his reputation is low, we freely reject his teaching, if high, we receive what he says with respect, but with clear remembrance that every man is of himself fallible; if the Author be all-perfect, our only reasonable attitude of mind is that of absolute acceptance of His statements. Since then God is the Author of the Scripture, whatever the Scripture conveys to us is true. This principle holds without distinction of the nature of the matter disclosed, of its greater or less importance with reference to what we conceive to be the principal purpose of the writing It is an imperfection in an author to insert irrelevant matter, still greater is the imperfection, and impossible in God, to insert what will lead the attentive reader into error This inerrancy cannot, of course, be asserted of every word which is attributed in Scripture to the characters mentioned, as when we read the question of the Jews (St Mark ii. 7): Who can forgive sins, save God only? We

no more accept their doctrine, than we accept it when these same people in the same verse say of our Lord that He blasphemed, all that the inspired writer is pledged to is the use of these words on this occasion In certain cases there may be a doubt whether what *prima facie* would seem to be the meaning of a passage is its true meaning, and commentators must apply all means of interpretation, and yet occasionally the doubt will remain. It is tolerably clear that Isaias in his fifth chapter is not writing about any particular existent vineyard, while commentators differ as to whether the Prophet Joel in his first chapter describes an actual visitation of locusts Extrinsic knowledge may show ground for not accepting the surface-meaning of a passage, and the result is that there is now more difficulty than formerly in the way of a satisfactory explanation of the history of the Creation The critic must also be on his guard against errors of translation and errors of transcription, but when all allowances are made, the principle remains true that the meaning conveyed to readers by the original document did not contain the smallest error It is no less certain that Jacob divided his substance into two companies, as told in Genesis xxxii 7, than that Absalom was slain as he hung in an oak. (2 Kings xviii 14)

The whole subject of the Catholic doctrine concerning the nature of Holy Scripture, its excellence, and the precautions to be observed in its study, will be found in the Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII., beginning *Providentissimus Deus*, and issued November

18, 1893. We here learn that God by His supernatural influence so stirred and moved the human writers, and so assisted them, that they rightly conceived in their minds that, and that only, which He bade them write, and that they willed to write it faithfully, and that with unfailing truth they expressed themselves aptly; for otherwise God would not be the Author of the whole of the Sacred Scripture

136 *The Fathers*.—The point which was insisted on in the last paragraph is of the highest importance, because there is a school of writers who think that they are at liberty to judge whether a given passage of Scripture is of doctrinal or moral importance, and if they find it to be of little weight, they will reject its historical authority. It will be worth while to cite a few passages of the Fathers, to show how far these great Saints and learned divines of early times were from admitting any such distinction in their conflicts with the rationalists of their time. The first shall be St. Justin Martyr, who in the course of his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew (n. 65, *P.G.* 6, 625), was challenged to reconcile two seemingly contradictory texts. He answers: "If you thought to lead me to acknowledge the existence of a contradiction in Scripture, you are mistaken. Never will I venture to entertain such a thought, or say such a thing, if anything be produced which has the semblance of being a contradiction in Scripture, and I am unable to clear it up, I will avow that I do not understand the passage, and will endeavour to persuade all who

are in perplexity to make the same avowal." The great St Augustine speaks with no less plainness "In dealing with these Books you must not say that the Author was mistaken, but either the reading is corrupt or the translation faulty, or you fail to catch the meaning" (St Aug. *Contra Faustum*, 11, 5; *P.L.* 42, 249) The same Saint expresses the same again in a letter to St Jerome (Epist. 82, n. 3; *P.L.* 33, 277), and in another letter to the same, he expressly denies the possibility of irrelevant inaccuracies, or officious lies as he calls them, finding a place in Scripture (Epist 28, c 3, n 3, *P.L* 33, 113), and he adds the reason that if once it be allowed that such a thing can exist in Scripture, every one will set down what is distasteful to him as being irrelevant This piece of foresight is fully justified by experience St Jerome expresses his horror at being supposed to wish to correct the Gospel narrative, while in reality his only wish was to restore the purity of the text (Epist 27, *ad Marcellam*, n 1, *P L* 22, 431), and his testimony is all the more weighty because he elsewhere shows himself fully alive to the difficulties with which critics have to deal, and we will conclude with one more testimony from a Greek, St Gregory of Nazianzum (Oratio 2, *De Fuga*, n. 105, *P G.* 35, 504), who holds that the diligence of the Spirit reaches to the smallest points and words If this looks like holding Verbal Inspiration, it is all the further removed from admitting error in Scripture.

147 *Recapitulation* —In this chapter we have set forth the formal teaching of the Church on the

inspiration of Scripture, and have proved it by the teaching of Christ, of the Apostles and the Fathers, all speaking as if God were the Author. The part of the human writer is then discussed, after which Verbal Inspiration is dealt with, and certain false views refuted, some of the Fathers being quoted to establish the absolute inerrancy of Scripture.

CHAPTER IV.

THE CANON

148. *Subject of the Chapter*—Having seen that the peculiar character of the Books of Scripture is found in their Divine authorship, we must now proceed to consider what are the Books to which this character attaches, or what books are *canonical*. The *Canon* of Scripture is the authentic list of the Books of Scripture, hence the subject of the present chapter is the determination of the Canon. On theological principles this determination presents no difficulty, we have an express declaration of the Church, which is clear and unmistakeable, and gives rise to no controversies, but the justification of this declaration from the accustomed sources, Scripture, Tradition, and Reason, presents no small difficulty. Scripture is silent as to its own extent, and Reason has no place in the discussion of a positive matter of this kind; there remains Tradition, and this has not always spoken with clear voice, for there was a period, corresponding more or less to the latter part of the fourth century, when some doubt existed within the Church; a doubt which, as we shall see, arose from scholars deserting the teachings of Tradition which had not yet been authentically

declared by the Church, and following the leadings of their own scholarship Some of these men, as St Jerome, were in the front rank for sanctity as well as learning, but they adopted a faulty method, and they fell into error.

The full discussion of the matter must be sought elsewhere It properly belongs to Introductions to Holy Scripture to justify the inclusion of each Book in the Canon, and the reader must be referred to Father Cornely's, or similar works. An historical question of this kind, turning on the opinion of various Fathers, would require copious citations from their works, together with such explanation as is necessary to show the true meaning; and these would occupy more space than we can afford. We can do no more than endeavour to point out the nature of the existing controversy, and indicate the line of reasoning which justifies the decision to which the Church has come.

149. *The rival Canons*—The list of canonical writings, as given at the beginning of our Bibles, contains seventy-three Books, of which forty-six belong to the Old Testament and twenty-seven to the New Besides these, it is not unusual to print in editions of the Vulgate three other Books, called the Prayer of Manasses and the Third and Fourth Books of Esdras The matter of these belongs to Old Testament times, but they are no part of inspired Scripture, the custom of printing them along with the inspired Books probably comes down from the days when the Canon was as yet unsettled, and is retained for convenience; their inferior

position is marked by their being placed at the end, after the New Testament In what follows we shall not be concerned with them

The great bulk of Protestants, if not all their sects, agree in accepting a less extensive list of canonical Books They reject seven of the Books of the Old Testament which we receive, as well as large portions of two other Books: in the New Testament the two lists are in perfect agreement The Books that they reject are Judith and Tobias, Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom, the Prophet Baruch, and the First and Second Books of Machabees

The Protestants give the name of *Apocrypha* to the Books of the Old Testament that they reject. But this word, by ecclesiastical usage, denotes what is of no authority, mere forgeries, the work of unknown authors who falsely assumed the names of Prophets and Apostles. The seven disputed Books are not of this nature, for even they who deny that they are inspired Scripture, acknowledge that these Books had a respectable origin, and that they may be read for example of life and instruction of manners But although the name Apocrypha is not fairly applicable to this group of Books, it is certainly necessary to have some name by which to distinguish them, for they stand apart from the other inspired Books in this, that at one time there was doubt in the Church concerning their authority. They might, if usage allowed, conveniently be termed the Disputed Books, as distinguished on the one hand from the Acknowledged Books and on the other from the Spurious. These classes are

discussed by Eusebius (*Hist Eccl* 3, 25; *P.G.* 30, 268—272), and were perhaps first established by him; the terms which he employs are ὁμολογούμενοι for the Books that were always acknowledged, ἀντιλεγόμενοι for those to which objections were raised, and νόθοι for those which found no defenders He is speaking of the New Testament, but his terminology is also applied to the Old The terms at present in most use for the Books of the first class is to say that they are protocanonical, while the second class are deuterocanonical, these cumbrous and meaningless words were first used by Sixtus of Siena, a converted Jew who lived in the sixteenth century, and became first a Franciscan friar, but afterwards a Dominican. He was one of the first writers who treated Scripture in what would now be call a "critical" spirit, and his works, brought out under the patronage of St. Pius V., had wide circulation, and his language passed into common use We may say then that Catholics admit to the Canon, and Protestants reject, the seven deuterocanonical Books of the Old Testament

In the New Testament also there are seven deuterocanonical Books the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Second Epistle of St Peter, the Second and Third of St John, the Epistles of St James and St Jude, and the Apocalypse, also, three passages from the Gospels fall into the same class, the last twelve verses of St Mark, the history of the Agony and Bloody Sweat in St Luke xxii. 43, 44, and the history of the woman taken in adultery, St John vii 53—viii 11. All these were at one time doubted

in the Church, and therefore cannot be called protocanonical; the history of the controversy in their regard is however quite different from that which treats of the Old Testament Catholics and Protestants alike receive the deuterocanonical parts of the New Testament, their Canons being identical

150 *The Canon. How determined* —We will now compare the principles on which Catholics and Protestants go in determining the list of Books that they receive

The Catholic Canon is found in the Decree on the subject adopted in the Fourth Session of the Council of Trent This Decree gives the list of Books which, it says, have been preserved in the Church, and reverenced, and treats this as in itself sufficient reason for receiving them, the adoption and approbation of the Decree was in itself proof that in the year 1546 this was the list which the Church of the time received, and on the principles explained in our Treatise on Tradition, and which will be more fully developed in the Treatise on the Church, this consent is conclusive upon the point. the Church cannot agree in error as to a point of revealed doctrine

The Protestant Canon, as received by almost all the various sects, is found in the Sixth of the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, which are part of the law binding on members of the Established Church of England. It is introduced as follows: "In the name of Holy Scripture we do understand those canonical Books of the Old and New

Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church" Then after the list of the proto-canonical Books of the Old Testament, the Article goes on "And other books, as Hierome saith, the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners, but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine." These are the deutero-canonical Books of the Old Testament Then "All the Books of the New Testament as they are commonly received we do receive and account them Canonical" No list is given

It will be observed that this Article sets up different standards for the Old and New Testaments In both cases it rests on the general acceptance of the Books by the Church. This is the true Catholic principle, but it is totally inconsistent with the teaching of another clause in the same Article, which insists on the sufficiency of Scripture as the Rule of Faith. (*Ante*, n. 78) In the application however of this rule to the Old Testament, it is required that there should never have been any doubt, while for the New, the actual consent of the Church in the year 1571, when the Articles were finally put into their present form, is held to be sufficient, and no account is taken of the grave doubts which once existed as to the authority of the seven deuterocanonical Books

151 *The Canon When established*—As before remarked (n 148), we cannot attempt to give the history of the Canon in this place. The first authoritative enumeration appears to have been that put forth by the Council of Carthage in 397

(Deut. 4:9), which contains all the books both protocanonical and deuterocanonical. This Council was not ecumenical, but its decrees were accepted by the Church at large, especially after the decrees of Innocent I and that of Gelasius in 494 (Denz. 59, 159, 162, 163, 297). By this time all doubt had died out of the Church, and as regards the seven disputed Books of the New Testament it has never been revived. To prove that such doubt once existed, it will be enough to quote St Jerome: "The Latins do not commonly receive the Epistle to the Hebrews as canonical Scripture, and the Greeks similarly reject the Apocalypse of John" (Epist. 129, *ad Dardan.*, 3, *P.L.* 22, 1003), and similar expressions are used concerning the other five Books which we have mentioned as being disputed. St Jerome himself accepted these Books, and the reason he gives is worthy of attention: i. the passage just quoted he goes on: "For my part I receive both being led to do so, not by the usage of the present day, but by the practice of the ancients." He recognized that if there had ever been consent in the Church, the fact that there had at another time been doubt was of no account.

There are other words in this same weighty passage which should be noticed. St Jerome has been saying that there was some doubt as to the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and he relates various opinions, assigning St Paul, St Barnabas, or St Clement as the author, but, says St Jerome, it matters not who is the author, for he is a Catholic, and his Book is constantly read in the

churches This passage shows that St Jerome was far from regarding Apostolic authorship as coextensive with inspiration, thus giving the weight of his authority against one of the theories current among Protestants

152 *The Old Testament*—As to the Old Testament, the claim of the protocanonical Books is established beyond a doubt by the fact that far the greater number of them are quoted as authoritative by Christ and His Apostles, as is shown by the Table of Citations which is to be found in most copies of the New Testament, and it is known historically that the whole collection was held in honour by the Jews of Palestine in the days of our Lord, so that no one seriously disputes the right to a place in the canon of those few Books which are not expressly quoted But as to the deuterocanonical Books there is some difficulty, and we must try to explain how the matter stands

These seven Books are not found in the Hebrew Scriptures as they are preserved among the Jews, which the Jews esteem so highly and preserve so carefully (n 132), and there is no reason to think that they were known, or at any rate held in honour in Palestine, during the years when our Lord was preaching, we may safely admit that they may have been unknown On the other hand, they are found in the Greek version of the Jewish Scriptures made about two hundred and fifty years before Christ, and said to be the work of Seventy Interpreters, and hence called the Septuagint those Books which were written after the date of the version, being

associated with the rest This Septuagint, as it now exists, containing the seven disputed Books, represents the Scriptures as they were received by those Jews who had adopted the Greek language and the centre of whose learning was at Alexandria This is indicated by the fact that the writers of the New Testament, Jews themselves, and in many cases writing primarily for Jews, but writing in Greek, habitually used the Septuagint version, which is the source of three hundred out of the three hundred and fifty citations from the Old Testament that are found in the New; and in many of the remaining fifty cases it is easy to see that the deviation from the Septuagint was rendered necessary by the particular purpose for which the citation was made (See Michaelis, *Introduction to the New Testament*, vol 1 p 215) It is clear, therefore, that the Apostles regarded the Septuagint as being the standard Greek version of the Scriptures

From the Apostles the same version passed to the Christian Church Other Greek versions of the Scriptures existed, but the Septuagint was the version in common use, and it naturally followed that all the Books which it contained were esteemed to be Holy Scripture Here we have the first stage in the history of the question (n. 113), general acceptance undisturbed by doubts Difficulties, it is true, arose, for Christian disputants who engaged in argument with Palestinian Jews were surprised to find that some passages cited by them as from the Scripture were not acknowledged to be of binding authority. This would occur as often as

a passage was taken from one of the deutero-canonical Books, for these do not occur in the Hebrew Canon, which alone the Palestinians recognized It was felt to be necessary to avoid rebuffs of this kind, and every one who wished to equip himself for controversy with the Jews took pains to ascertain which were the Books from which he might safely quote It was for this reason that about the year 160, Melito, Bishop of Sardis in Asia Minor, undertook a journey into Palestine in order to learn what books were received by the Jews of that country. It is inconceivable that he undertook this labour as the only means for learning what were the Christian Scriptures, for as to this he could have learned the tradition of his own Church of Sardis, besides which, Palestine was no longer a great Christian centre, and this consideration is our guide in interpreting the letter in which he gives the result of his investigations it is preserved by Eusebius (*Hist Eccl* 4, 26, *P G.* 5, 1215, 20, 396, Routh, *Reliq Sacr* 1, 120) The catalogue which he gives omits the deuterocanonical Books, but it does not undertake to show more than the list of Books which the Jews acknowledged.

In the course of the third century, however, doubts began to find their way even into the Church Thus, not far from the year 240, a man of learning, named Africanus, an historian, wrote to Origen, a famous Christian professor, to inquire as to the deuterocanonical part of the Book of Daniel which contains the history of Susannah and the Elders. Origen s reply sets forth clearly the way

in which all such questions are to be treated much of what he says applies to all the deuterocanonical Books of the Old Testament The two letters will be found in the works of Origen (*P G.* 11, 41—85) The difficulty brought by Africanus was two-fold First, he adduces certain intrinsic difficulties which seem to him to show that this portion of the Book cannot be Divine, and secondly, he argues, as of most importance, that the history is not found in the Daniel which is in use among the Jews In modern language, Africanus thinks that criticism and antiquity are both against the history Origen, in his reply, takes the objections in an inverse order: from the alleged witness of antiquity, he appeals to the undeniable witness of the Church of his own day, and having established his point by the authority of tradition, he proceeds with confidence to deal with the critical difficulties This is exactly the Catholic procedure After adducing various instances in which there is a difference between the Jewish and the Christian Scriptures, he ventures to speak ironically of his correspondent's objection (*P G* 11, 57) "So then it comes to this we must make no account of all the copies that are current in the churches, and lay it down as a law to Christians to do away with their own Sacred Books, and go, cap in hand, to the Jews, begging them to share with us their pure and unpolluted Scriptures Can it be," he proceeds, "that the Providence which by the Holy Scripture gives edification to all the churches of Christ had no heed for those bought with a price, for whom Christ died?" It is

plain that Origen made more account in this matter of the living Church than of dead antiquity

Nevertheless, this same Origen was engaged on a work which gave rise to a controversy which lasted for more than a century This was the compilation of his *Hexapla*, the Six-fold, an immense undertaking in which he exhibited the whole of the Old Testament Scriptures in six distinct forms, arranged in parallel columns Only fragments of this great work have survived they occupy vols xv. and xvi. of the *Patres Græci*. The first column exhibits the Hebrew text the second gives the same in Greek letters; the remaining four are occupied by as many Greek versions those of the servilely literal Aquilas, made about the year 128 after Christ; of the Septuagint (B.C. 250), of Theodotion, somewhat earlier than 176, founded upon the preceding, with changes which were not always for the worse, so that this version is still used in the Eastern Church, in place of the Septuagint, for the Book of Daniel; and lastly, that of Symmachus, who was somewhat free in his rendering of difficult passages. (See Lamy, *Introductio*, I, 148—154)

This work became widely known, and brought to the minds of all interested in the matter that the seven Books were not extant in the Hebrew; and doubts as to their authority arose in the minds of many, who had not Origen's grasp of principles. The extent, however, to which these doubts prevailed has been much exaggerated, and they seem never to have led to anything like fixed opinion

CHAPTER V.

VERSIONS AND INTERPRETATIONS OF SCRIPTURE.

154. *Subject of the Chapter.*—The fundamental difference between Catholic theologians and the expounders of the various Protestant systems is found in the view taken as to the Rule of Faith In our second Treatise we showed that Catholics regard the living voice of the Church at all times as being the authentic interpreter of the Divine Revelation, and that there is no appeal from this voice, and that if Scripture or Antiquity or any other basis of argument seem to contradict this living voice, we are at once assured that there is error either in the principles or in the reasoning founded on them The Protestant theory, on the other hand, holds that the Written Word of God is the supreme rule, that the revelation given by God is to be learned by each Christian reading the Bible, and that this reading, conducted under proper conditions, will not lead him astray. In the present chapter we shall explain the doctrine of the Church on the popular use of Scripture, and the precautions which are necessary, if the food provided for the souls of men is not by misuse to be turned to poison

each Hebrew word. Applied to the first verse of Genesis this theory would give the result "In heading created Gods with the heavens and with the earth," which is not greater nonsense than the specimen of Aquila's handiwork that stands in Origen's *Hexapla* Literal translation in this sense assumes that every language contains some word which is the exact equivalent of each word in every other language, which is clearly false, further, it assumes that a combination of words in one language yields the same sense as the combination of the equivalent words in every other language, which is, if possible, still more false, as will be seen at once if the attempt be made to render on these principles the simplest passage from one language into another In fact, as we have already remarked, every translation is in truth a commentary The simple Protestant, therefore, adopts as his rule of faith a human work, while he believes it to be Divine

156 *Imperfect and false renderings* —The difficulties pointed out in the preceding section are inherent in the work of the translation, but they are very much enhanced when the work is undertaken by incompetent men, and the possibility of dogmatic prejudice and downright fraud must always be had in mind The British and Foreign Bible Society has no difficulty in finding men who will undertake to translate the Scriptures into any language, however rude and destitute of the most elementary terms of religion, and particulars as to the deplorable result will be found in the

first chapter of Mr. Marshall's *Christian Missions* What is commonly, and perhaps deservedly reputed as the best of the Protestant vernacular translations, is that which forms the authorized version of the English Establishment, and which was put into its final shape in the year 1611. In 1870 a revision of this version was begun, and the result in due time appeared, showing that a vast number of alterations were deemed necessary, but the way in which the work was done has not given satisfaction to those interested, and it is quite possible that a revision of the revised version will appear before long Meanwhile, the authorized version holds the field It was with reference to this version that Mr Thomas Ward compiled his book called *Errata*, being a long list of passages where the translators had allowed dogmatic prejudice to determine their choice of phrases, while cases are not wanting in which words seem to have been deliberately altered or omitted because the true version seemed too favourable to the Catholic side of the controversy Thus in Cant vi 8, both the authorized and the revised version insert a *but*, without authority from the Hebrew original, thus weakening the argument which sees in this passage a proof of the unity of the Church Also, in Malach ii 7, both these versions read *should*, instead of *shall*, making the passage no longer point to the office of the Bishops and priests of the Church to be in a special manner the guardians of Divine Revelation, but the worst case is 1 Cor. xi 27, where the translators put *and* in place of *or*, which was

required by all the authorities to which they had access The revisors have altered this *and* to *or*, but meanwhile ten generations have read the words that falsely represent St Paul as declaring a Divine command that the Holy Communion was to be received under both kinds. Another case is seen in Hebrews xiii 4.

157. *The Church and Versions*—The Church regards the Written Word of God as a most precious treasure entrusted to her keeping by her Divine Founder, to be used as an instrument in doing the work which she is commissioned to accomplish, and seeing the necessity of translations being made, seeing also the difficulty of the task and the ease with which corruptions may be introduced, she sedulously watches over the production of versions, especially in vernacular languages. She knows also how difficult is the work of interpreting the Scriptures, and that it is no less true now than it was in the days of St. Peter, that the unlearned and unstable wrest the Epistles of St. Paul and the other Scriptures to their own destruction. (2 St Peter iii 16) She has therefore laid down certain rules for the guidance of her theologians in the interpretation of Scripture, and she has legislated with regard to the printing of editions and versions, and their use especially by the laity. The Church herein proceeds upon a theory totally opposed to that acted upon by the supporters of Bible Societies The work of these Societies is to scatter printed copies of versions of the Scriptures, without note or comment, as widely

as possible in all the countries of the world, and enormous sums of money are yearly expended upon this enterprise, with how little fruit will be seen by the reader of that first chapter of Marshall's *Christian Missions*, which we have already quoted in the preceding section Foolish as the proceedings of these Societies are, it must be admitted that the promoters act consistently upon their theory This theory, which we have already met with on several occasions, holds that the perusal of the Written Word of God is the divinely appointed means of salvation for all men, on this theory, to scatter Bibles is to spread the Gospel, just as on the Catholic theory that faith comes by hearing (Romans x 17), not by reading, the way to spread the Gospel is to send preachers duly commissioned to carry on the work of the Apostles. We have already sufficiently discussed the two rival theories, in our Treatise on the Channel of Doctrine but we may add a few citations from some of the earliest Fathers, to show how far representative Christians about the year 200 were from holding the Bible Society theory St Irenæus speaks of the barbarians as believing in Christ without the aid of ink and paper (*Contra Hær* 3, 4, *P G.* 7, 855), Tertullian (*De Præscript* 14, *P L* 2, 27) gives a solemn warning against engaging with heretics in argument on the sense of Scripture, and Clement of Alexandria (*Strom* 1, 20 and 2, 6, *P G.* 8, 816, 960) expressly states the Christian method is that faith comes by hearing, which he contrasts with that of the Greek philosophers. It will be remem-

bered that these three writers represent the faith and teaching of almost the whole of the Christian world. (See n. 51)

158. *The Vulgate.*—There is one only version of the Scriptures which has received the formal approval of the Church this is that one among the Latin versions which obtained general currency in the West, and goes by the name of the Vulgate, or ordinary version. As to this, the Council of Trent declared not only that the Books contained in this version, with all their parts, were inspired, but also that among all the current Latin versions this one was to be held as *authentic*, and as such was used by the Council in proving the dogmas of the Church, and reforming morals

This declaration of the Council (Sess 4, Denz 666, 667) is often misunderstood It does not imply the entire conformity of the Vulgate to the originals, and it is perfectly allowable to suppose that the translator was misled by false readings in the manuscript that he used, or that he mistook the sense of what was before him The work of critically settling the text, and of interpretation, is not interfered with by the Decree, as a matter of fact, the critical value of the Vulgate stands high, but it is not conclusive. But the meaning of the declaration is this that in an argument upon a question of faith and morals, there is no appeal from the authority of the Vulgate whatever propositions, in these spheres, follow from the Vulgate are undoubtedly true It may be that the corresponding passages of the

originals did not yield the same sense, this is a question for theologians to discuss (n. 84) and whatever follows from the original texts as to faith or morals, or any other subject, is to be implicitly received as the Word of God to man (n 145). but it will never be shown that the teaching of the Vulgate on faith and morals is in conflict with what we know on the subject from the originals, or from other sources of knowledge of Divine truth On other subjects the interpreter may, if he think right, discard the Vulgate, though if he be wise he will be very slow to do so Thus the Council leaves him free to form his own opinion as to the species of plant that sheltered the Prophet Jonas (Jonas iv 6), and he may believe that it was a kind of gourd, as the current Hebrew and Septuagint have it, and not ivy, as in the Vulgate this is a point of botany, not of faith or morals, and on such a point we are sure that the teaching of the original was correct, but we have no authentic means of determining what that teaching was, especially, it must not be hastily concluded that because the original was written in Hebrew, therefore it is faithfully represented by the Hebrew which is now current it is possible that a casual mistake has crept into the text

159 *Interpretation of Scripture* —We have seen according to Catholic doctrine, the agreement of Christians on any point as having been revealed by God is decisive of the truth the whole Church cannot go wrong It is, therefore, in perfect accord with this doctrine that the Council of Trent, in the same Session (Denz 668) forbade all interpretations

of Scripture which were opposed to the unanimous consent of the Fathers We have seen (nn 93—95) that in certain cases the existence of this unanimous consent can be inferred, even where few writers have treated of the matter, and we must carefully distinguish between the witness of the Fathers to the Tradition that they have received, and their judgment as critics, on points as to which they have received no tradition. In the former case, their unanimous voice is decisive, in the latter, it is possible for more recent criticism to have discovered reasons for adopting a different view. We may illustrate this by the case of the Days of Creation. The Fathers are not unanimous as to what is meant by them (See St Augustine, *Genesis ad Literam*, 4, 27, *P L.* 34, 314, *De Civit Dei*, 11, 7, *P L.* 41, 322) But even were it otherwise, they would have spoken merely according to their knowledge, seeing no reason to doubt that *Day* in the first chapter of Genesis had its natural meaning: if considerations drawn from the teaching of geology or other sources lead us to doubt whether they were correct in their *judgment*, we shall not be going against their *witness*. (See n. 322) The same remark applies to the passages of Scripture which have been thought to be opposed to the Copernican astronomy (Psalm xciii 1; Josue x 13, &c.). it was natural to take them as referring to absolute motion, so long as no reason to the contrary was seen; but there was no tradition on the subject, and therefore there was no objection to understanding them of relative motion, as soon as reason to do so was adduced.

We shall speak again of the case of Galileo in another place (n 292), we here only remark that no unanimous consent of the Fathers, if such existed, would bind us to accept the Ptolemaic hypothesis. The doctrine on this matter is given shortly, but quite clearly, in the Encyclical lately quoted. (n 145)

160 *The use of Versions* —The Church, aware of the evil that is apt to result from the rash use of Scripture, especially of versions in the vernacular, has guarded it by various regulations We can do no more than give a very short sketch of the Common Law upon the subject, which law, however, is by no means necessarily binding in any particular country modifications to suit the varying circumstances of the populations have frequently been introduced by custom or otherwise The Common Law, however, forbids the use of all copies of the Scriptures that have not been printed under the responsibility of some Catholic no translations into the vernacular are to be made unless accompanied by proper notes, to guard against the danger of misunderstanding, and they must not be printed without the approbation of the Ordinary These rules are the more necessary because the Bible Societies sometimes print editions of their own, founded on former editions which had received approval they retain the approbations, but omit the notes, and often corrupt the text, in this way endeavouring to mislead the unwary An episcopal approbation does no more than allow the printing of the work it by no means implies that the prelate

giving the approval agrees with all that is said: in fact, the person that gives the approval will sometimes see reason subsequently to withdraw it

The essential opposition between the Catholic spirit and the spirit of Jansenism comes out clearly in the condemnation by Pope Clement XI, in the Bull *Unigenitus* (1713), of the following propositions taught by Quesnel:

LXXIX. To study and know the spirit, piety, and mysteries of Holy Scripture is at all times and in all places necessary to all sorts of men.

LXXX. The reading of Holy Scripture is for all.

LXXXI. The obscurity of Holy Scripture is no reason for laymen dispensing themselves from reading it.

With much more to the same effect. (Denz. 1294—1300.)

It may be suspected that many of those who advocate the indiscriminate reading of the Bible are but imperfectly acquainted with the contents of some of the Books, and they fail to observe that not a single text can be cited so much as hinting that Christians ought to look to a book to find the doctrines of their religion: all the texts commonly cited refer to Jews, who are exhorted to search the Old Testament, where they will find proof that He Whom the Apostles preached was the true Messiah, but when that is clear, they are to receive His doctrine from the mouth of His messengers. (See n 83.)

161. *Recapitulation*.—Having in our first and second Treatises spoken of the Christian religion

and its evidences, and the Channel of Doctrine, our third Treatise has been devoted to Holy Scripture. In successive chapters we have spoken of the meaning of Scripture, of the special character of the Books, and their Inspiration, after which we have determined what Books form the collection. Lastly, we have explained the necessity of having translations of the Scripture, and pointed out why the task of furnishing them is so difficult, and shown that the work has often been done with negligence, prejudice, and even fraud. The attitude of the Church towards versions is then explained and justified, the special position of the Vulgate is explained, together with the caution to be observed in the interpretation of Scripture. Lastly, we have sketched the Common Law as to the translating, printing, and reading Scripture.

Treatise the Fourth.

The Church.

CHAPTER I.

Existence of the Church.

162 *Plan of Treatise.*—Already, more than once, we have mentioned the Church, and have assumed the existence of the institution which goes by this name. In the present Treatise we propose to explain what is meant by the Christian Church, to give proof of its existence at the present day and for all time to come; to discuss its nature, when it will be shown to be a visible, organized society; to show who are its members, what powers and privileges the society has, and how they are exercised, and to prove that it possesses certain properties which admit of being recognized, and thus become notes by which it may be distinguished from all other associations of Christians.

In the following Treatise we shall discuss the question of the position of the Bishop of Rome in the Church, for it will be shown that his position is unique, and this Treatise will complete the

preliminary part of our Theology, sometimes called Fundamental Theology. Although, as just now remarked, in the course of our second and third Treatises we occasionally assumed the existence of the Church, thus anticipating a part of the fourth Treatise, yet it will be found that the Fundamental Theology is complete in itself, except so far as it assumes the existence of God, the proof of which truly primary verity must be sought in Philosophy with such helps as Revelation affords, and which will form the subject of a subsequent Treatise

In the present Treatise we shall assume the supreme authority of the Holy Scriptures, as a fount of doctrine acknowledged by all Christians; and we shall not have occasion to use passages taken from the Books the authority of which is disputed. We shall adduce passages from the Fathers to show that our doctrine is not new, and we shall draw something from theological reason, to illustrate the matter.

163 *Subject of the Chapter.*—In this chapter we shall explain what is meant in Christian language by the Church; and we shall show that the institution denoted by this name was brought into existence by Christ, that it has ever existed, still exists, and will exist till the end of time; and that it is of such nature that membership is constituted by something which is in its own nature external, and does not depend purely on anything interior, in other words, we shall prove that the Church is *perennial* and *visible* This chapter is of vital importance in the controversy with Rationalists

and Protestants. It is closely connected with the Treatise on Tradition, for we saw that the Church is the divinely appointed guardian of the Tradition of the faith, which must therefore be received from the Church; but this is impossible unless the Church exists at all times and exists in such a way that it can be discovered

164 *Meaning of "Church"*—The word "Church" is not one the derivation of which throws light upon the meaning It seems to be a changed pronunciation of the Greek *κυριακον*—"belonging to the Lord,"—and in its earliest use it signified a building set apart for Christian worship. So at least it is explained by Mr. Skeat (*Etymological Dictionary*, s v.) However this may be, in its present use it corresponds to the Greek *ἐκκλησία*, a word which, with various changes of spelling, is found in almost all the languages of Christendom, except those which, like the English, employ forms of *κυριακόν*. (Scotch *kirk*, German *kirche*; on the other hand, French *église*, Italian *chiesa*, Welsh *eglwys*, &c.) The Latin form is *ecclesia*

In classical usage, the *ἐκκλησία* specially signifies an officially summoned assembly, as of citizens engaged on political business (see Liddell and Scott, s v.); the derivation being from *ἐκ* and *καλέω*, to call out, select. The word is used in this sense in the Septuagint (1 Paral xxix 1; cf xxviii. 1); and possibly in the New Testament (Acts xix 32, 40), though it seems more likely that the crowd at Ephesus was an informal gathering. (Cf. v. 39) In Ecclus. xv. 5, and elsewhere, it is used of a social

gathering. But the ordinary use in the Old Testament refers to meetings for religious purposes, or to the place of such meetings (See Deut xvii 16, xxiii 1—3, Psalm xxvi 23, in which senses, however, the common word is *συναγωγή*, Exodus xvi 3, xxxiv. 22, &c) In the New Testament this word occurs frequently, being once used of a Christian place of meeting (St James ii 2), and once or twice of an assembly of the Jews (Acts vi 9, xiii 43), but in the great bulk of cases, it plainly means the building where the Jews met for religious and other purposes (Also called *προσευχή*, Acts xvi 13, 16· see also Juvenal 3 296) In St Luke vi 12, we read that our Lord passed the night *ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ τοῦ θεοῦ*, which the Vulgate understands of prayer to God The word has also been understood of some building used for prayer. The one sense does not exclude the other, we should understand that a night passed "in the chapel" on the eve of some eventful day, had been passed "in prayer." On the other hand, the word *ἐκκλησία* in the New Testament is almost always used of a collection of believers in Christ, the only exceptions being the passages from Acts xix, referring to the multitude who were so zealous for the honour of the patron goddess of Ephesus, and two quotations from the Old Testament (Acts vii 38; Hebrews ii 12) It is in this sense that the word *ecclesia* passed into Latin, and so many other languages, and this is also the ordinary sense of the words church and the like the context will always show whether the place is meant, or the congregation who are united

by the bond of acknowledging the teaching of Christ; the former sense is the primary with *church*, the latter with *ecclesia* (See Suicer, *Thesaurus*, s.v. ἐκκλησία.)

165 *Church and Churches*.—If we study in the Concordance the list of passages where the word Church occurs, we should find that not unfrequently it is used in the plural (Acts ix. 31; 1 Cor. xii. 17, Apoc. i. 4, &c.), and often even when it is in the singular, the sense is clearly such as implies that the plural is possible; as in Acts viii. 1, "the church that was at Jerusalem," implies that there might be churches in other places, if in Romans xvi. 5, we read of "the church" which was in the house of Prisca and Aquila, we may suppose that there were "churches" in other pious families, see also 1 Cor. iv. 17, Apoc. ii. 1, &c. In these places where the word "church" is used to denote what is actually or potentially multiple, the thing meant clearly is a body of believers in Christ among whom some local bond of connection existed, probably that of assembling for prayer and instruction in the same room. Thus when "the church" is mentioned in Acts xii. 1, there is no local reference, for the scene at the close of the preceding chapter is laid at Antioch, while the events of c. xii. occurred at Jerusalem. In Romans xvi. 23, the Vulgate tells us that Caius, the host of Paul, and "all the church," saluted the Romans, which words must perhaps be understood of the church in his house, but the Greek text makes Caius, host of Paul, and of the whole church, which can scarcely

be understood of the local church, for he would not be called the host of his own townspeople, it would seem that he was in the habit of receiving all comers, provided they were Christians, members of the one Church. A yet plainer place is Ephes v 25, "Christ loved the Church, and delivered Himself up for it that He might sanctify it," which certainly is not said of the Ephesian Christians alone Other like passages may be found in the Concordance, but the principal of all is St Matt xvi. 18, where Christ says On this Rock I will build My Church We shall meet with this verse in more than one place of this and the subsequent Treatise, at present it is enough to point out that it plainly implies the existence of one institution which is spoken of as the Church of Christ. See also St. Matt xviii. 17.

No explanation of these passages can be suggested except that according to which the multitude of believers throughout the world were united together and formed one body, in virtue of some bond of union which was not local, but of a different nature; concerning which we shall inquire later.

This double use of the word church passed into the ordinary language of Christendom. According to Catholic doctrine every Christian is a member of the unique Church, and is also, regularly, a member of some smaller body, such as those which we speak of as the Church of Africa, the French Church, the English Church, each of these being made up of several still smaller divisions to which the name of church is given, as when, on the anniversary of the

consecration of a Bishop, we pray for him as presiding over the church of such and such a city, naming his see: this being the phrase used in the prayer said on that day in all Masses within the diocese. While Catholic usage speaks of the Church of each episcopal see, and of national Churches, which are groups of episcopal Churches, united by a local or political bond, it never loses sight of the existence of the one Church to which all Christians belong, and which is called the Catholic Church, or the Church of God, this is mentioned in the Collect used on the anniversary of the coronation of the reigning Pope, who, as we shall see, presides over all particular Churches and over all their members.

The usage of many sects of Protestants gives the name of church to the people who worship in a particular building, or even confine it to a select few among them, who alone are admitted to Communion and to a share in government There does not seem to be any particular harm in this mode of speech, which however is not supported by those passages of Scripture, such as Romans xvi. 5, which speak of what we may call "family churches," for these passages afford no indication of church-membership even in its strictest sense, being confined to select members of the family, see Acts xvi. 33, where the gaoler "and all his house" were admitted to Baptism But, however this may be, the important point is to distinguish between the one Church of God, Church of Christ, Catholic Church, and those congregations of Christians

which participate in the name of Church; the prerogatives that belong to the one, and the associations attaching to its name, are not the portion of the others, except so far as their members are children of the one great Mother. This very important point is developed when we speak of the unity of the Church

166 *The Church Perennial* — We have now explained what we mean by the Church it is the company of believers in Christ We have now to show that this Church is perennial · that is to say, that from the days of Christ down to the present day there have always been men who hold the doctrine that Christ taught, and that there never will come a time when this doctrine will wholly disappear from the earth in other words, not only that Christ will never be forgotten, but also that His doctrine will never be lost through corruption This perennial existence has been denied to the Church by two classes of heretical sects Some have held that the truth had perished at some point of time which is generally left undefined, and that they were raised up to restore it to its primitive purity · others hold that the original doctrine of Christ was imperfect, that it has been improved as time went on, so that a return to the primitive doctrine would be a retrogade step Heretics of the first class more commonly maintain that the truth was always held by some obscure handful of men, even in the worst times, and they are most conveniently dealt with when we prove that the perennial Church is essentially visible The second

class who hold that human reason, and the progress of civilization, have improved upon the original revelation can hardly be called Christians, although many of them would claim the name Such are some of those who take the name of Unitarians, as holding the unity of person in God; these do not use Baptism in the Name of the Blessed Trinity, which as we shall see in its place is required for membership of the Church. Their position is scarcely different from that of avowed Rationalists, who regard Christ as not being a Messenger from God, except so far as being a man of higher moral enlightenment than most of His contemporaries

That the Church is perennial is defined doctrine, contained in the Creed as it is recited in the Mass: "Of His kingdom shall be no end," the phrase being taken from the words of the Angel of the Annunciation (St. Luke i 33), who speaks of the reign of the Son of the Most High in the house of Jacob, the Church on earth A teacher cannot be said to reign when his teaching is universally abandoned This Creed is that which was adopted at the Council of Constantinople in 381, except that the one word *Filioque* was added to it by Papal authority It is an enlargement of the Creed of Nice (325), which ended with the words, "And in the Holy Ghost" The phrase with which we are now concerned is not found in the Nicene form, but it was introduced by a Council held at Laodicea in 341, when Marcellus of Ancyra was condemned. (See S Athanas *De Synodis*, n. 22, *P G* 26, 721) The form here adopted was, "Who remains King

and God for ever," which is substantially the same as that adopted forty years afterwards at Constantinople. The precise purpose of the addition made at Laodicea is unknown, for it does not seem to have any particular connection with the Sabellian error of which Marcellus, the friend of St. Athanasius, was accused.

167 *Proof of Perennity.* — That the Church of Christ is perennial follows from the prophecies contained in the Old Testament to this effect. It will be sufficient to cite Ezech xxxvii 24—28, which passage admits of no explanation except that which we give it, in view of the palpable fact that the Jewish temporal polity has been overthrown. The same follows from the prophecy of the Angel Gabriel (St Luke i. 33), who assures our Lady that there should be no end to the Kingdom of her Son The promise of our Lord that the gates of Hell should not prevail against the Church (St Matt xvi 18) proves the same as does the other promise that He would be with the preachers of the Gospel "even to the consummation of the world" (St Matt xxviii. 20) It will be sufficient to cite one Patristic passage more will be found when we speak of Visibility That which we now choose is the close of St Jerome's commentary on Amos "As long as the world shall last, persecution may shake the Church, but shall never overthrow it the strength of the Church shall be tested, and shall abide the test. This will be so, because the Lord God Omnipotent, Who is the Lord God of the Church, has promised that so it

shall be: and His promise is an unchanging law." (*P.L.* 25, 1096.)

The means by which Divine Providence secures this lasting firmness is to inspire Christians with a jealousy of novelty. We have seen how keen was this jealousy (n. 99); and it is especially to be observed that general corruption of doctrine could not result from error being introduced in several places independently, for these partial corruptions could never lead to general agreement in the *same* error, whereas we know that the same doctrine is held throughout the world

The Christian religion being founded on a Divine Revelation, nothing short of a similar revelation could supersede it But we have seen (n. 112) that no such revelation is to be expected: and it is this that distinguishes the case of the Church from that of the Synagogue. We have distinct assurance that the Christian Revelation is final (Hebrews xii 26, &c.), but we have no similar revelation in regard to the Jewish economy. It is true that phrases are found which taken by themselves, and without reference to the actual course of events, might seem to promise perpetuity to the Synagogue (3 Kings ix 3, &c) But these promises were not falsified when the new revelation came, as had been foretold (Deut xviii 15), and substituted for the Old a New Covenant (Jerem xxxi. 31), which perfected that which had gone before

168 *The Church Visible*—It remains for us to show that the Church is perennially *visible*. For a society of men to be *visible*, in the sense in which

the word is used in Theology, it is not enough that the individuals composing it should be visible, in the sense in which all men are capable of being seen, but the fact of their being associated must be visible that is to say, the bond of union among them must be of its own nature cognoscible by the senses, and it must be of such magnitude as to attract attention to itself

There are two theories current among Protestants in opposition to the doctrine that the Church is always essentially visible. One boldly declares that no visibility whatever is required, and that Church membership is purely internal. the other is forced by the plain teaching of Scripture to admit that in some sense the Church must be visible, but holds that it need not be conspicuous: according to this view it suffices if there have always been some true professors to be found on the face of the earth. Its adherents, therefore, labour to show that in all ages there have been sects which maintained pure Scriptural religion, even during the twelve centuries during which the whole world was "plunged in damnable idolatry," as the Church of England Homily expresses it: when, in the words of Milton, "all our fathers worshipt stocks and stones" and since it is true that there always have been heresies rife in one place or another, about which very little is known, the work has been done to the satisfaction of its doers · forgery having been used to eke out the scanty records of history (See Bradshaw, *Collected Papers*, p. 8) The truth is that the sects in question under various names—

Albigenses, Waldenses, Cathari, &c.—maintained a tradition of Manichean doctrine, maintaining the essentially evil character of matter, a doctrine which, whatever is to be said about it, is certainly not Scriptural, and from which in many instances consequences were deduced subversive of morality and social life

It does not appear that the word "visible" has been applied to the Church in any binding utterance; but the doctrine that the Church is visible is implied whenever the Church urges the duty of submission to her teaching, for there can be no duty of submitting to an invisible body, and the contrary doctrine was condemned by Pope John XXII. in 1318 The Pontiff, by his Bull *Sancta Romana et Universalis Ecclesia*, enumerates and condemns five errors which were maintained by one section of that miscellaneous collection of zealots, some of them Catholic, and some heretical, who went by the name of Fraticelli. The fifth and last of these errors is (Denzinger, 417) that the Gospel had not received its full perfection before their time, but had been prostrate and even extinct Also, Pope Pius VI., by his famous Constitution *Auctorem Fidei* (August 28, 1794), condemned as heretical the assertion that in these last times religious truths of the greatest moment had become obscured (Art 1 Denz 1364) These condemnations leave no doubt that the perpetual visibility of the Church is an article of the Catholic Faith.

169 *Proofs of Visibility.*—The proof of this doctrine from Scripture is easy: it follows from

well-nigh every place where the Church is mentioned. Thus in the Old Testament, Isaias (II 2) tells us that in the last days, the days of Christ (Acts II 17, Hebrews I 2), the mountain of the house of the Lord should be prepared on the top of the mountains, and all nations should flow into it, and many people should go to it, for the Word of the Lord should come from Jerusalem

This passage admits of no interpretation, except that which makes it ascribe visibility to the Gospel dispensation The mountain of the Lord was to be so placed as to be visible, and there could be no doubt whether a given person dwelt there or not. Nearly the same is read in the parallel passage of Micheas IV. I. Moreover, whatever doubt there may be as to the details of the interpretation of the vision of the four kingdoms in the second chapter of Daniel, there can be no doubt that the kingdom which the God of Heaven should set up, and which should consume all those kingdoms, and itself stand for ever, is the Church of Christ Yet the terms in which it is described plainly point to visibility The New Testament is yet more clear. "The Kingdom of Heaven," in the thirteenth chapter of St Matthew, is likened to many various objects, most of which obviously teach the same lesson, and we read in St Matt v 14, 15, that the city seated on a mountain cannot be hid; and that the lighted candle is set on a candlestick, to give light to all that are in the house a most expressive mode of saying that the Gospel was to be brought to the knowledge of all the world, which cannot be, unless

the association of believers were "visible." It is needless to multiply these references

The testimonies of the Fathers on the subject will be found in Waterworth's *Faith of Catholics*, 1 189—199 They are too long for transcription in this place. We can do no more than quote one or two plain sentences "It is an easier thing for the sun to be quenched than for the Church to be made invisible," says St. Chrysostom (*In Oziam*, Hom 4, n 2; *P.G.* 56, 122) And St. Augustine tells us that the Church has this sure mark, that it cannot be hid. for this reason it is known to all nations, but the party of Donatus is unknown to most, this party therefore is not the Church. (*Contra litt Petiliani*, lib 2, cap. 109, n. 239, ad fin , *P L* 43, 343) This holy Doctor repeatedly employs the argument drawn from visibility against the Donatists, who ventured to maintain that the whole world except themselves had fallen into error, so that the true faith was confined to the corner of Africa where they dwelt. (Epist 44, to Eleusius; *P L.* 33, 175; Epist 208, to Felicia; *P L.* 33, 952)

The visibility of the Church is necessarily implied in the right of governing her subjects which, as we shall see, the Church has (St Matt xviii. 17, &c.), and in the duty incumbent on all men to submit to the Church, as will be explained hereafter (1 St. Peter iii. 21.) An invisible association could not fulfil the function of making disciples of all nations (St Matt xxviii 19), nor could it be the pillar and ground of the truth. (1 Timothy iii. 15)

170 *Difficulties against Visibility*.—The difficulties that may be raised against the visibility of the Church fall into three classes. Some are such as may be directed against the visibility of any human society, the English nation, for example. There may be doubts as to when this nation first became conspicuous in the world, but there is no doubt that it is conspicuous, and there may be doubts as to what precisely constitutes English nationality, but there is no doubt that a large mass of men possess this nationality. What is here said of a nation is true also of the Church. Other objections proceed upon the ground that the cluster of spiritual gifts that make up what we call the state of grace are interior and invisible, and yet without them there is no effective membership of the Church, so that it is impossible to tell who are members and who are not so. All this is true, if we speak of perfect membership, but we shall show before long (n. 186), that there is an imperfect membership for which these graces are not requisite, but which is secured and indicated by outward signs, also, the state of grace will tend to make its existence known by outward effects. Lastly, it is urged that faith and sight are opposed (1 Cor. xiii. 12), and yet we profess our belief in the Church, in the Apostles' Creed. The full answer to this difficulty belongs to the Treatise on Faith, when we shall speak of the obscurity of faith, the reply in short is, that there is nothing to prevent an object being known in two ways, one of them clear and the other obscure, besides which my belief tells me that the

assembly which I see visible before my eyes is the Church founded by Christ, which is certain, but not evident. (n. 201.)

171. *Recapitulation.*—In this chapter we have explained the meaning of the words church and churches; we have shown that the Church is perennial and that she is visible; and we have indicated the lines to be followed in answering the difficulties that may be brought against the last-named doctrine.

CHAPTER II.

THE END OF THE CHURCH.

172. *Scope of Chapter* —Hitherto we have been considering the Church as being the assemblage of believers in Christ, who were under such special providential guidance that they would never cease to hold the truth In the present chapter we shall endeavour to show that the Church is more than this that it is a society, the members of which are bound together by something more than holding a common belief, and that it is the duty of every man to join this society and to obey its laws This will be the place to explain the true meaning of the maxim, so often misunderstood, that out of the Church there is no salvation

173 *Meaning of Society* —It is not every collection of men that constitutes a Society this word is not applicable unless the collection have some essential bond of union It belongs to writers on Ethics to discuss this matter fully it will be enough for us to give some necessary explanations.

Co-operation towards a common end is the bond of union Whenever it is found that several independent units are working together to bring about a result, there is some sort of society. The word

cannot be properly applied unless the units are conscious that they are co-operating, which they cannot be unless they are individually capable of conceiving what it is to work for an end Thus it is only in an analogical sense that we can speak of societies of bees, or of the animals that work together to build up coral islands, for assuredly no particular beast recognizes that the formation of honey-comb or of dry land in the midst of the ocean is an object on which it is well to expend its energies, no more than the trees of a forest are aware that they are working together to secure moisture for the earth, or the waves of the sea to construct a breakwater of sand. No true society then can be formed, except of men or angels, for none but spiritual beings are capable of working for an end.

To form a society, it is not enough that the members should desire the attainment of the same end they must exert themselves towards its attainment, using such means as are suitable to their nature and capacity These means will vary immensely according to the circumstances of various men, but they derive unity from the oneness of the end to which they are directed

174 *Societies Classified.*—We may distinguish societies the members of which are free to follow their own will as to whether they will work for the common end, or will refrain and those in which they are morally bound to do their part, so long as they continue to be members. A cricket club is an example of the first, a religious congregation of the second sort. Again, there are societies the members

It is to be observed that every permanent, stable society is entitled to the name of a *state* and it follows that the Church is a state. But this word is not often used, except as meaning the civil state, which is distinguished from the ecclesiastical the word *civil* is inserted whenever there is risk of ambiguity

176. *The Church Supernatural*.—What we have said as to the end of the Church suffices to prove that the Church is a *perfect* society, or one which is self-sufficing, not needing the aid of any other society; and this because its end is independent, and not included in the end of any other society, such as the civil state. The end of a railway company is to facilitate communication, which belongs to the temporal well-being of the people, and thus comes within the end of civil society; a railway company, therefore, is not a perfect society But the end of the Church is nothing temporal, except so far as the present life is the time during which each man is bound to secure his eternal end The end of the State, therefore, does not include the end of the Church

It is in and through the Church that the work of Christ is carried on in the world This follows from the charge given by Christ to His Apostles (St. John xx 21): "As the Father hath sent Me, I also send you," and other texts on the same subject (St. Matt. xxviii 18, St Mark xvi. 15), and we see from 2 Cor. v 20 that St Paul regarded himself as being an ambassador for Christ The work of Christ is double He once for all redeemed

mankind by His Death on Calvary, and this redemption is continually applied to individual men by the ministry of the Church

The Church is to be called a Supernatural Society, inasmuch as its end is something above nature understanding by nature that which is required by the constitution of man, of body and soul It will be shown in its proper place that man might have been created with no destiny but that which would be required by his nature, as being composed of a rational soul informing a material body But the actual destiny prepared for man is something higher than this, being the sight of God, called the Beatific Vision, and the end for which the Church is established is to assist man to lead a holy life on earth, and by so doing to attain to his eternal end This end being supernatural (St. Thomas, *Sum. Theol* 1 2 q. 5 a. 5), the Church may be called a Supernatural Society Moreover, the foundation of the Church was supernatural, being the work of the Son of God made Flesh. admission to it is obtained, as we shall see, by Baptism, and the means of sanctification which it employs are the other Sacraments, which are supernatural. and it is under the special supernatural guidance of the Holy Spirit.

177 *Christ the Head, the Church the Body* — Much that has been said in the last paragraph needs illustration and development to be obtained from various parts of Theology. But the doctrine that the Church is supernatural follows at once from the view which the Fathers have derived from

the Scripture, that the Church may be spoken of as a Body, under Christ the Head. This idea is set forth in the whole of the twelfth chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, and is used by St. Paul as the foundation of an argument on a practical matter; and in the fourth chapter of the Epistle to the Ephesians we read that Apostles and other pastors were given for the edifying of the Body of Christ, that we may in all things grow up in Him Who is the Head, even Christ. (See also Ephes v. 22—24.) The Fathers point out that this doctrine involves the pre-eminence of Christ over the Church; for, as St Augustine observes (*On the Christian Struggle*, c. xx. n 22, *P.L.* 40, 301), the head, where the senses have their place, is in a manner the representative of the soul of man, and in like manner Christ is the Head over all the Christian people Again, the influence of the head redounds into the whole body, which derives all its living power from the head, and so we read in St. John (i 16), that of the fulness of Christ we all have received; and St. Paul tells us (Coloss ii 19), that from the head the whole body, by joints and bands being supplied with nourishment and compacted, groweth unto the increase of God In like manner, Origen says (*Contra Celsum*, vi 48, *P G.* 11, 1373), that the Word of God, moving the whole body, that is to say, the Church, as need requires, moves also each member of them that belong to the Church

178 *The Mystic Body*—When it is wished to distinguish the natural Body of Christ which formed

do their duty in all respects, which will include their doing their duty as members of the other societies; and each will find its advantage in thus acting. Parents will train their children in habits of piety and of respect for authority; while the State lends the assistance of its physical force to secure both the family and the Church in the exercise of their rights The Church assists the other societies by its insistance upon the duty of piety, which regulates the relations of superiors and inferiors, urging the doctrine of St. Paul that every soul should be subject to higher powers, for there is no power but from God, and this for conscience sake (Romans xiii. 1—5); and again, that children should obey their parents in the Lord (Ephes vi. 1) In point of fact, we learn from history in how many ways the influence of the Church has helped to promote the end of civil society, which is the temporal well-being of man. It has not always succeeded, but its tendency has been to abolish slavery, by teaching that all men are brothers of Christ; to exalt women, by declaring that marriage was raised to the dignity of a Sacrament, and proclaiming it indissoluble, as well as by exhibiting the high dignity of the Mother of God; it has restrained tyranny, for God shall judge the tyrant, it has effectively urged men to visit the tribes of barbarians, bringing civilization along with religion, and it has wrought a revolution in the condition of the poor, by the simple promise that what is done to them shall be regarded as done to Christ (St. Matt. xxv. 40.)

180. *The Ends compared*.—We have seen that the three societies may work together in harmony, and will do so, if all do their duty. But cases may arise of apparent clash, and it is necessary to consider what course is to be adopted. The matter is settled by considering the ends: the end of civil society is superior to that of the family, and the end of the Church is the chief of all; for the work of the family belongs principally to infancy, that of the State to adult life, while that of the Church is mainly attained beyond the grave, and concerns eternity. It follows that when parents plainly and grossly neglect their duty to their children, the State is in its right in controlling them, as if they starve their children, neglect to provide them with medical care and education, or bring them up in ways opposed to common morality. In like manner, the Church curbs the gross excesses of the State by solemn condemnation, which gives voice to the judgment of the people, and sometimes by inflicting excommunication or other spiritual punishments for crime, more frequently, however, by the passive attitude of refusal of obedience to an unjust command, with patient endurance of the results, on the principle taught by the Apostles, that we ought to obey God rather than men (Acts v. 29).

What has just been said is independent of the question as to the right by which the Roman Pontiffs at one time were accustomed to take what may seem to have been purely political action, it may be that they acted merely in virtue of a right accorded to them by the public law of Christendom

More will be found on the subject of this and the foregoing sections in a future page (nn 300—305)

181. *Duty of Membership.*—It is explained in Ethics that that conduct of man is morally right which tends to bring him to his end. We have already seen (n 176) that the end of man is the supernatural possession of God, and the point will be proved in its proper place, man is therefore bound to use all means available to him for attaining this end, among which must be reckoned membership of the supernatural society which has been divinely instituted to help men to attain this end. It is, therefore, the duty of every man to become a member of the Church, and, being a member, to obey its laws Just as with all other duties, no man sins by omitting to join himself to the Church if for any reason it is impossible to do so, or if he be ignorant of his duty If a person has never heard of the claims of the Church to his obedience, his ignorance obviously excuses him from sin in not obeying, for there is no sin where there is no malicious will, and his ignorance prevents his exercising any will in the matter. Also, if he has heard something of the claims of the Church, and has inquired into the foundation of these claims without arriving at assurance that they are based on a Divine command, he is excused, for under these circumstances it is not certain to him that there is any law binding him But the case is different if the doubt as to his duty arise in his mind and he fail to take pains to clear it up, using as much diligence as he would use if some weighty temporal

interest of his own were concerned. Such neglect will be more or less faulty according to the greater or less urgency with which the duty of inquiry presents itself to his mind, ignorance may excuse from the fulfilment of a duty, but it may itself be sinful, as resulting from the neglect of some other duty.

The spiritual position of those who live and die outside the visible communion of the Church, does not concern us now; it will be considered in its place, in the Treatise on Grace At present, it is enough to say that, as we believe, there is no eternal torment in store except for such as freely, knowingly, and wilfully violate the law of God in a grave matter, and persevere in their rebellious disposition to the end of their time of probation.

At the same time it must be remembered that, though the position of men who are outside the visible communion of the Church may possibly not be sin nor the result of sin, yet it is a grievous misfortune. Membership of the Church is a position which entails duties, but to which also immense privileges are attached; chief among these is the right of participating in the Sacraments, which are the principal means by which the merits of the Death of Christ are applied to individuals; and this itself is only a part of the life-giving influence which is ever flowing from Christ the Head to the members of His Mystic Body See the same idea under another figure in St John's Gospel. (xv. 4) The subject of doubts as to faith will recur. (n. 317.)

What we have been saying is embodied in the short maxim, that outside the Church there is no salvation All who attain salvation without being visible members of the Church, do so by virtue of an invisible membership. In this way are reconciled the declarations of the Fourth Lateran Council under Innocent III in 1215, *Extra Ecclesiam nullus omnino salvatur*—"Outside the Church no man whatever is saved" (Denz 357; see also 635), and the Decretal of the same Pope (*ibid* 343) with the Encyclicals of Pius IX (Denz 1504, 1529), who teaches that God in His goodness cannot allow any one to pass to eternal punishment who is not guilty of wilful fault. The rule is that salvation belongs to the members of the visible body, as to others, we have no distinct revelation, but we know that God is just. St. Pius V. and other Popes have condemned the proposition put forward by Baius, that there is sin in purely negative infidelity, in those to whom Christ has not been preached

What we have given as the rule follows from what we have said as to the Church. Salvation is through Christ, the Church is the means by which the work of Christ is perpetuated on earth The parting words of our Lord (St Mark xvi. 16) promised salvation to him that believes and by Baptism becomes a member of the Church, and the doctrine of St Peter (1 St. Peter iii. 20) teaches that in the Ark of Noe a few persons were saved by water, whereunto Baptism being of the like form saveth us also It is in accordance with this Apostle that St Augustine speaks (*De Unitate Ecclesiæ*, c. 5,

n 9; *P.G.* 43, 397). No Christian doubts that, without interfering with the truth of the narrative, which tells how the house of the just man was saved from the Flood while the sinners perished, the Ark of Noe was also a figure of the Church Origen also, commenting on the history of the spies who were received by Rahab (Josue II 19; VI. 22), remarks that outside this house, that is to say outside the Church, no man is saved (Origen, Hom in lib *Jesu Nane*, 3, n 5; *P.G* 12, 841.) The phrase of St Cyprian is to the same effect No one can have God for his Father, who has not the Church for his Mother. (*De Unitate Eccl.* n. 6; *P.L.* 4, 503.)

182 *Recapitulation*.—In this chapter we have described what is meant by a society, and pointed out that there are three principal societies, to which every one ought to belong, and which are distinguished by their ends Among these it is shown that the Church is a supernatural body having Christ for its Head; and that the three can work harmoniously together, but that in case of clash, the Church should prevail Lastly, that is not a duty alone, but a privilege and advantage to belong to the Church.

CHAPTER III.

THE MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH.

183. *Subject of Chapter.*—The Church of Christ, as we have seen (n 172), is a society made up of living men In the present chapter our task will be to consider what men they are that belong to this society; what are the terms of admission, can one who has once gained admission lose the privilege: if so, can he regain it, and on what conditions We shall find that the answers to these questions are in some cases furnished us by formal definitions of the Church; in other cases, no such definition can be found, but there is such an agreement among persons of authority that the answer to be given is not open to doubt, while in yet other cases the point is still freely discussed in the Catholic schools. A great part of the discussion is of a fundamental nature, touching the leading points of difference between the Church and many of the forms of Christianity that exist in Western Europe and in America, and the whole throws much light upon the true character of the sacred society

184 *Terms defined*—It will be necessary in the course of this discussion to use certain terms which enter into the questions which we are to discuss,

but the full meaning and bearing of which cannot be understood until we come to them in their proper place, in the Treatise on Grace and elsewhere We shall find that some of the warmest controversies of theology turn upon the exact nature of the things denoted by these terms, but an explanation of these terms, sufficient for our present purpose, can be given without the introduction of any controverted matter This will be sufficient for our purpose, and we proceed to endeavour to give it

I *The Blessed The Lost* —Probably all who bear the name of Christian agree that, at the close of the present life on earth, men pass through death to another form of life and that in this other life each man will find himself in one or the other of two great classes, between which there is a broad, essential, enduring difference. those whose place is in the one class enjoying a happiness which the members of the other class are without. The doctrine is founded on countless passages of Scripture, among which it may be sufficient to refer to St Matt. xxv. 33 The discussion of the nature of the life of the two classes belongs to the Treatise on the Four Last Things We will speak of these classes as the Blessed and the Lost

II. *The Just Sinners.*—It follows that every man, at each instant of his existence on earth, is in such a state that if he die at that instant he will either be one of the number of the Blessed, or of the number of the Lost Following the usage of the Holy Gospel (St Luke v. 22) we will call these the Just and Sinners respectively. With a change of

phrase, we sometimes speak of the Just as being in the state of grace, and of Sinners as being in the state of sin. The sense in which this term is generally applicable to infants who have never been guilty of any sinful act will be seen when we speak of Original Sin.

III. *Predestined Foreknown.*—God knows all things, past, present, and to come: wherefore, among the rest, He knows, of each man, whether after death he will be one of the Blessed or of the Lost; or, in other terms, whether at the instant before death he will be one of the Just or of the Sinners We hold, with St. Paul (1 Timothy II. 4), that God will have all men to be saved, or, in other words, that He has destined each man for a place in the ranks of the Blessed, and that in the case of the Lost this Divine destination has been frustrated God simply knows beforehand that they will not attain to that for which He destined them. Hence, the word Predestined rightly expressed the state of those living men who after death will be among the Blessed those living men who after death will be among the Lost are fitly said to be Foreknown We shall see in the Treatise on Grace that this doctrine of Predestination in no way interferes with the freedom and responsibility of men, and that it is sound advice in which the doctrine of St Augustine has been summed up. If you are not predestined, act so as to make yourself be so. (See Franzelin, *De Deo*, p. 592)

IV *Justification Sin*—We hold that a person is sometimes transferred, by the free mercy of God

with or without his own concurrence, from the number of Sinners to the number of the Just. and that no one of the Just ever passes to the ranks of Sinners unless he commit a mortal sin, that is to say, freely and knowingly do some act which God has forbidden under pain of His grievous displeasure This shows the meaning of the term Justification and Sin If a Scripture basis for this language is sought, it will be found in Romans III 24 and I. 32 Throughout the reasoning life of a man he is liable to sin (I Cor. X 12), and he is capable of Justification (Ezech. XVIII 27.)

185 *Figures of the Church*—In Holy Scripture we find various figures employed to describe the Church, and each of these teaches us some new lesson The Church is the Vine, which spreads its branches everywhere (St John XV. I—7), and every leaf of which owes its life to its connection with the Stem. The Church is the House where God is the Householder, Who cares for His Family while they remain with Him, and if they have left Him is ever ready to receive them when they please to return. (St Luke XV. II—24) The Church is the Sheepfold, wherein are sheep and goats, all of which the faithful Shepherd defends from the ravening wolves that devour whatever they find beyond the fence. (St. John X. II—16) The Church is a Kingdom, and is repeatedly spoken of by St Matthew as the Kingdom of Heaven, while St Mark and St. Luke prefer the phrase Kingdom of God. But there is no figure more constantly employed than that of a Living Body, such as the body of man, in which at

once we distinguish Head and Members or Limbs This figure recommended itself especially to St Paul, who uses and enlarges on it repeatedly (Romans xii , 1 Cor vi.; 1 Cor xii), and from him the usage has passed into the language of Catholic theology, and it is usual to speak of the Head of the Church, and of the Members or Limbs that constitute the association.

186 *Soul and Body of the Church.*—But when the Church is compared to a body, it must be remembered that this is a living body, for the Church is not a dead corpse Now, we know that in a living man there is a material body informed by a spiritual soul · the body considered as being apart from the soul is dead, while the soul is essentially living, but we have not the full life of a man unless soul and body are fittingly united together From these considerations we are led to inquire whether there is anything in the Church that corresponds to the soul and body of a living man. Now the body, considered as a mere mass of matter, is equally ready for many purposes; it is the union with a human soul which determines it as being a body of a man In the same way, a society is a collection of men, but there must be something beside and beyond the fact that a number of men are gathered together that determines them as being a society of this or that character there must be some end which it is proposed to attain by association, and some spirit permeating the society, and leading each of its members so to shape his individual conduct as more or less to promote this end. It will often be difficult

to put into words what it is that constitutes this spirit, and it will sometimes be yet harder to feel assured how far it is partaken of by all those who in outward semblance belong to the society; also, we often have reason to believe that the spirit exists in some men who do not, in a material sense, belong to the association. This is well seen in the case of a nation. There is some principle, some oneness of spirit, which unites all men who are entitled to be called Englishmen, although it might be hard to state with fulness and precision what elements are found in this spirit. Regularly and in the bulk of cases the possession of this spirit goes along with birth and residence in England; and in a certain true sense, all in whom this material element is found may be called Englishmen. But not in the full sense, for there is little doubt that there are persons resident in England who are wholly devoid of the English spirit, who make to themselves an end diverse from the end of the English nation, and whose action is directed to the attainment of the end which they have proposed to themselves; while, on the other hand, there may be persons resident in other countries who are full of a spirit which is, in fact, the English spirit whether they are aware of it or not. On these principles we can distinguish the soul and the body of the English nation. The external fact of residence marks who belong to the body; possession of the spirit makes the man belong to the soul: regularly, the soul and the body are composed of the same persons, but exceptionally, there may be persons belonging to the soul

who belong not to the body, and belonging to the body who belong not to the soul.

In exactly the same way we speak of the Soul and the Body of the Church. The Church is a society of men instituted by Christ, and having for its end to lead and enable men to avail themselves of the redemption of the human race wrought by the Founder, and this society is as we have seen (n 168) visible: it has an external organization. But it is important to know whether the possession of the spirit is co-extensive with the outward organization, or whether, on the other hand, the spirit may in some instances be found beyond the bounds of the organization, while in other instances it is lacking within those bounds In other words, we must inquire what constitutes membership of the Soul of the Church, and who they are that are members of the Body.

187. *Who belong to the Soul* —From the explanation given it follows without difficulty that they, and they only, belong to the Soul of the Church who, if the question were now to be settled, would be found to have secured to themselves the fruits of the Redemption, to have the spiritual life abundantly that Christ came to give (St John x. 10); to be partakers of the Divine Nature (2 St Peter 1. 4), as St. Peter speaks for these only are fit to pass to that union with God which constitutes the state of the Blessed, in other words, the Just and the Just alone constitute the Soul of the Church (n 184, II.)

It will be seen that membership of the Soul of the Church is a present fact, and is independent of

past and future, he that is a member of it may cease to be so by Sin, he that is not a member may become so by Justification (n. 184, IV.) Exactly the same is true of nations: he that is now full of English spirit which actuates him in all his conduct may once have been the determined enemy of England, and may hereafter again take up this spirit of enmity It follows that there may be some of the Predestined who do not now belong to the Soul of the Church, and some who now belong to that Soul but are not of the number of the Predestined

We have been speaking so far of the fulness of membership of the Soul of the Church; but it is certain that many who are not of the number of the Just nevertheless are receiving something of the benefit of the Redemption, for they receive grace which tends to lead them to Justification, and without which they cannot be justified, as will be seen in the Treatise on Grace these, then, may be said to belong to the Soul of the Church, but in an imperfect sense

It will be observed that there are no outward means of telling, except by mere conjecture, what men do belong to the Soul of the Church, and what men do not belong to it neither have we any information, beyond conjecture, what proportion of mankind belong to it at any given instant God has reserved to Himself this knowledge and the knowledge of the number of the Predestined. (2 Timothy ii 19, and the Secret said in the Mass during Lent)

188 *Who belong to the Body*.—There is little room for difference of opinion as to the matter discussed in the last paragraph. when once the meaning that we ascribe to the phrase "Soul of the Church" is understood, it follows as of course that the Soul is co-extensive with the Just But it is otherwise with regard to the Body of the Church; and some of the profoundest differences between Catholics and other Christians show themselves in connection with the question who belong to the Body of the Church Also, this is a question on some branches of which there is not absolute agreement among Catholic theologians We shall first state what is defined doctrine: then deal with the principal errors opposed to it, and lastly, discuss some of the points on which we have no declaration of the Church

We have seen in the earlier part of this Treatise that Christ established a society to continue His work on earth, and enable each man to reap the benefit of the Redemption which He wrought, and this society is indicated in the Scriptures by various figures, some of which we have cited. (n 185)

We have then now to inquire who they are that are branches of the Vine who belong to the Family of the Great Householder; who are the sheep that are within the Fold, who are the subjects of the Kingdom. who, finally, are members of the Body To discover the answer to these questions we must look in the Gospels, for it is in them that we read what are the dispositions which it pleased the

Founder to make, and it must always be held in mind that the matter is determined by His will, and cannot be settled by any speculations of our own as to what arrangements we should think convenient We must see what are the conditions of membership conditions which in the Divine design were to be fulfilled by all the human race (Isaias II. 2, Romans x 12), and the fulfilment of which secures great spiritual blessings which are lost by those in whose cases the conditions are not fulfilled, whether the failure be wilful or unavoidable. Following this method, we find that the Founder required that every member of the Church should be admitted by the initiatory rite of Baptism The closing charge given by our Lord to His Apostles was to go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them with the rite which then became a Christian Sacrament (St Matt xxviii. 19), and the Apostles acted on the injunction, as is seen in many passages of the Acts (II 38, VIII 12, VIII 36, IX 18, &c), and of the Epistles (Galat III 27) A condition of this Baptism was the profession of belief in the doctrine taught by the accredited ministers of the Church (Acts VIII 37, XVI 31), and they who had been received into the society retained this belief and continued in spiritual communion with the Apostles. (Acts II 42.) And in these three elements, Baptism, profession of belief, and communion with those who have authority in the Church, especially by reception of the Sacraments administered by them, we have all that is required to constitute any man a member of the Body of the Church

The whole of this doctrine will be better understood when the following paragraphs are read, in which we deal with various errors upon the subject of the Body.

189. *Various Errors*—It will be observed that all the elements which we have just explained as requisite in a member of the Body of the Church are of an external nature, and this is in agreement with our doctrine (n 168) that the Church is *visible*, for a society is not *visible*, in the sense explained, if membership of it depends upon purely internal facts, especially if they are such as are known to God alone. Perhaps no one has asserted the necessity of any further external condition distinct from those that have been mentioned, so that our doctrine is admitted by all writers who uphold the doctrine of the Visibility of the Church, as is done by the writers of some schools within the Established Church of England; and this agreement is perfectly consistent with great variety of belief as to the true nature and conditions of Baptism, as to the faith which it is necessary to possess, and as to the persons by whom lawful Sacraments are administered.

But other schools within the Establishment, together with perhaps all other Protestants, set up the need of certain internal elements in the character of a member of the Body of the Church, and these consistently deny that the Church is Visible. The systems which are advocated by these have their speculative side, by which they are connected with certain erroneous views on the nature

of justification and on the impossibility of one who has once been in God's favour and Just, in the sense explained in n 184, falling away and passing to the class of Sinners But these same systems have their practical side, which perhaps constitutes no small part of their attractiveness, for they open a door which afforded escape from the yoke of subjection to authority The view that no one was a member of that Body of the Church which has authority to enforce discipline if certain interior, invisible elements were wanting to him, was supplemented by another equally false doctrine that no share of the authority of the Church could be exercised by one who did not belong to the Body (See n 193) Hence it was easy to conclude that no one was bound to render obedience to a man in whose case he judged that these internal requisites of membership were wanting, and as a judgment of this kind was purely arbitrary, the doctrines in question in fact afforded an excuse for declining all submission to ecclesiastical authority, and it was a not unnatural sequel to say that no civil authority over Christians could belong to one who had never acquired or had forfeited the name of Christian.

We need not dwell on the history of the Novatian heresy, which sprang up about the year 251, starting from the true doctrine that to obtain a false certificate of having complied with the law of the persecutors by sacrificing to idols was a grievous sin, these heretics maintained that these *libellatici* (n 133) were incapable of pardon, that all who communicated with them, in like manner,

were guilty of unpardonable sin, and forfeited all authority in the Church Hence they concluded that Pope St. Cornelius, who had compromised himself in this manner, was no longer Pope, and they proceeded to supply him with a successor, and thus the honour of being the first anti-Pope falls to Novatian The particulars will be seen in any history of the Church. for example, Rohrbacher (3, 285, seq) In like manner, the Donatists maintained that the whole Church, except themselves, had become corrupt through holding communion with some *traditores* (n 133), who had delivered up the sacred books at the bidding of Diocletian, and they are often taunted by St Augustine with holding that the true faith which ought to be world-wide was confined to a corner of Africa (St. Augustine, Epistle 44, *P L.* 33, 175, and Rohrbacher, 3, 489, &c) In just the same spirit, the Fraticelli, in the thirteenth century, held that the holiness of spiritual life and authority were not to be found beyond the bounds of their own body a tenet which was condemned by Pope John XXII in 1318 (Denz 414) Just a century later, we find Pope Martin V , in the Council of Constance, condemning a number of propositions taught by John Wyclif in England, and by John Hus in Bohemia, among which we have, that no one is civil governor, prelate, or bishop while he is in mortal sin (Denz 491), that the prayer of the Foreknown is of no avail (*Ibid* 502, and see n 184 *ante*), and that the Church is the collection of the Predestinate Similar views were held by Luther and Calvin, and as to the

moral results we may consult the two little books mentioned in the Note below[1] and the same prevailed among the Jansenists, whose heresy had so much in common with that of Calvin, and whose history and teaching will come before us more than once One of the most prominent among them was Pasquier Quesnel, a Frenchman, whose *Reflexions Morales sur le Nouveau Testament* was published in 1694 These Reflections were expressed in language of great piety, and insidiously conveyed doctrines the plain statement of which would have shocked a reader who retained any Catholic principles It may suffice to quote one "There is nothing of more ample reach than the Church of God, for it is composed of all the Elect and Just of all ages" (Denz 1291) Here we have a covert insinuation that the Elect and the Just are co-extensive classes, and that no man is in the Church who does not belong to the Elect and Just This doctrine, along with a hundred other similar remarks, was justly condemned by Pope Clement XI, when in 1713 he issued the Bull *Unigenitus*, the conflicts concerning which fill so large a place in Church history. Finally, we may mention the Synod of Pistoia, an assembly of Tuscan Bishops who gathered together in the year 1789 under the guidance of the Grand Duke Leopold and of Scipio Ricci, the Bishop of the place of meeting. These

[1] "The Truth about JOHN WICLIF, chiefly from Evidence of his Contemporaries" by JOHN STEVENSON, S J

"The Only Reliable Evidence concerning MARTIN LUTHER" by HENRY O CONNOR, S J

put into form a large body of propositions on various points of faith, morals, and discipline, which embodied the views that recommended themselves to the Emperor Joseph II., brother of Leopold, and defended by the courtly theologian, Hontheim, who published, under the name *Febronius*. These were condemned in the Bull *Auctorem Fidei*, issued in 1794 in which Pope Pius VI. condemned a large number of errors which had been taught at Pistoia, affixing to each its proper censure. Among the rest, the 15th (Denz. 1378) denounces as heretical the doctrine that none belong to the Body of the Church except the faithful who are perfect worshippers in spirit and in truth.

St Ignatius of Loyola seems to have had a wise foresight of these and similar errors for in his book of Spiritual Exercises, when laying down rules "for maintaining due harmony of feeling with the Church," he gives the first place to the following: "Laying aside all judgment of our own, we must keep our minds prompt and ready to obey in all things the true Spouse of Christ our Lord, which is our Holy Mother, the hierarchical Church" The meaning of this epithet is that our obedience is due not to any abstract Church of our own imagining, but to the Church as actually represented and ruled by the men who compose the various ranks of the Hierarchy under the Supreme Pontiff (See Ferrusola, in *Exercitia*, p 2, sect 7, cap 2)

190 *The Predestined*—The various condemnations that have been quoted leave no doubt as to the doctrine of the Catholic Church persons who

are not Predestined may be members of the Body of the Church, as may also persons who are in the state of sin, and there may be persons who are Predestined, or who are Just, who do not belong to this Body As already explained, both these doctrines follow immediately from the doctrine that the Church is Visible, for whether each particular man is Predestined and whether he is at each instant Just, are secrets known to God alone But we will here give direct proof that Predestination is not a condition of membership, and in the next paragraph speak of Sinners

The point must be settled by the language of Holy Scripture, and this language puts the matter beyond doubt It cannot be denied that the communities to whom the Epistles of the Apostles were addressed belonged to the Body of the Church These Epistles are full of expressions of the writer's anxiety lest any Christian should fail to live up to his vocation St Paul did not believe that his own salvation was secure unless he used the means needed for securing it (1 Cor ix 27), and clear proof must be given before we can believe that Hymeneus and Alexander were among the Predestined, although we read of them that they made shipwreck concerning the faith, and were delivered up to Satan that they might learn not to blaspheme (1 Timothy i 20) Whatever may be the exact meaning of this phrase, it suggests that St. Paul did not believe that these men were among the Predestinate, and yet they had been members of the Church St Peter knew that those to whom

he wrote stood in need of fear (1 St Peter iii 16), St John knew that some Antichrists went forth out of the Christian body (1 St John ii 19) It is Christians who are reminded by St James (i 15) that sin begetteth death, and St Jude (verse 4) speaks of ungodly men who secretly entered in and despised dominion All this is inconsistent with the idea that all the members of the Christian communities were necessarily Predestined, nor, on the other hand, can we hold that all the Predestined are Christians, when we remember that Christian converts came in from the ranks of the Jews and heathen Predestination belongs to the Predestined man throughout his existence, before his conversion no less than after

The difficulties that are urged against our doctrine, from Scripture and the Fathers, will be considered in n. 192

191 *The Just*.—That sinners may be members of the Church follows from the parables and figures which are found in the thirteenth chapter of St Matthew's Gospel We there read of the cockle that was sown among the wheat, and which sprang up and was allowed to remain until the end, and the explanation which is added leaves no doubt as to who are represented by the wheat and the cockle In the same sense we read that the Kingdom of Heaven is like to a net which gathers all kinds of fishes, good and bad, and retains them, till it is drawn to shore, and again we have the express declaration that this means how at the end of the world, but not till then, the angels shall separate

the wicked from among the just In the same St. Matthew (xviii 17), we read of the power given to the rulers of the Church to excommunicate the obstinate sinner, if he refuses to hear the Church he is to be as the heathen, which implies that up to that time he was a Christian, in spite of his sin St Paul acted on the power thus given (1 Cor. v), expressly declaring that there was no authority in the Church to judge any but them that were *within;* it follows that the sin which incurred punishment did not of itself put the sinner *without* the body of the Church

That the Fathers held our doctrine is abundantly evident from the whole course of the controversy with the Donatists. It will be sufficient to quote one short passage from St. Augustine, where we have a formal statement. Commenting on the Parable of the Marriage Feast (St. Matt. xxii 1—14), and remarking that the marriage was filled with guests, gathered from the highways, both good and bad, he goes on "Such in our own day is the Church, full of good and bad" (Serm. 250 n. 2; *P.L* 39, 1164) Also, if sinners cannot partake in the privileges that belong to members of the Church, it is impossible to explain the existence of the Sacrament of Penance; in this Sacrament pardon is granted to souls stained with the gravest sins, if only this pardon is sought with due dispositions, as will be explained when we treat of this Sacrament The Sacraments of the Church are for her members Also the Sacrifice of the Mass is daily offered for all the faithful, for the remission of their sins.

192 *Difficulties* —The objections that are brought against our doctrine are multifarious, and we cannot afford space to go fully into all They will be found collected, at considerable length in Dr Murray's very learned and complete work (*Tractatus de Ecclesia Christi*) This writer has ransacked the writings of Protestant divines (Disp iii sec 3), and sets forth their arguments in their own words, adding his answers The variety of form which can be given to the objections is very great, and we can do no more than deal with some specimens belonging to different classes, with our replies

I. The argument from the Parable of the Cockle assumes that the field in which the seed is sown is the Church; whereas this field is the world, as we are expressly told. (St Matt xiii 38) I reply that the crop is the Church, set in the world and comprising both wheat and cockle

II. Though some of the Corinthians were for a time irregular in their life, yet these irregularities did not deprive them of their holiness, for St Paul addresses them as saints (2 Cor. i 1.) But, he used this word of the whole community, not as necessarily applicable to every one, it was truly applicable to many.

III. Nothing can belong to the Body which is not under the influence of the Soul, but sinners are not members of the Soul of the Church I reply that, although they are not members of the Soul in the full sense, yet they share to some degree in the life that the Soul communicates. (See n. 187.)

IV. Christ is the Head of the Church, but the Body of Christ cannot have members who are members of Satan, who cannot say, "Our Father Who art in Heaven" The reply is that sinners are not altogether cut off from Christ, if they retain the faith, and these, being sons although undutiful, can address God as their Father.

V Arguments are drawn from the very obscure passages, Ephes iv. 15, Coloss ii 19, 1 St Peter ii. 4, for the development of which, with the replies, recourse must be had to Dr Murray or Cardinal Franzelin (*De Ecclesia*, 440, &c) The scope of these passages is confessedly not clear, and it is a sound rule of interpretation that obscure phrases must be interpreted by what is clear, not conversely The passages which we adduce in support of our doctrine seem clear

VI The same remark must be made concerning stray passages which are gathered from the voluminous works of St Augustine. Those who are familiar with the method of this holy Doctor know that he frequently speaks of things according to the ideal which they ought to attain, and not according to the state in which they actually are, also, that in his controversial writings, it is often difficult to be sure how far he is speaking according to the mind of his adversary rather than according to his own, meeting him on his own ground, as it were But the interpretation of St Augustine is a work for a lifetime

VII St Paul frequently uses the word saint or elect as equivalent to Christian. (Romans xvi. 15

2 Timothy II. 10) He does this because they belong to a Church which is holy in the end it aims at, the means it uses, and in the doctrine it teaches, also in the holiness of many of its members (See the Sixth Chapter of this Treatise)

VIII. Some writers have thought to support their cause by urging that if there be one sinner in the Church, why not two, and three, and so on, till not one just man remained? This is of a piece with many other difficulties against the Catholic Church that are introduced with the words "why not?" The answer is that if the thing in question would be the ruin of the Church, then our Lord's promise (St Matt. xxviii. 20) to be with His Apostles all days is our reply to the question *why* the thing could *not* happen

IX. Others yet more weakly urge that if a sinner be a member of the Church militant on earth up to the moment of his death, then he must needs be a member of the Church triumphant in Heaven, for these are the same Church in different states, and there is nothing in death to destroy Church-membership. We reply that the crop in the ground and the crop in the barn may be called the same crop, but in different states, but we read that the reapers shall, in the time of harvest, gather the cockle and bind it into bundles to burn, but shall gather the wheat into the barn (St. Matt xiii 30)

193 *Heresy*—Our subject may be illustrated by a few words concerning the Church-membership of some other classes of persons; and first of heretics. A proposition is heretical which is inconsistent with

the teaching put forward by the Church in pursuance of her infallible authority as being part of the Revelation which she has received. A heretic is one who, having been baptized, holds an heretical proposition. To be a heretic is a grave misfortune, whether it be accompanied by the sin of heresy or not, there being no sin in this or in any other matter without a wilful contempt of known duty. All this will be more fully explained in the Treatise on Faith; meanwhile it is enough to say that an open heretic is certainly not a member of the Body of the Church, for unity in faith is one of the properties of the Church, as will be seen hereafter (n. 220); nor does it matter whether the heresy has come to the knowledge of one or two only, or whether it be known to the whole world. One who is inculpably in heresy may belong to the Soul of the Church, but it is part of his misfortune that he does not share in the general suffrages of the faithful and the other spiritual advantages which are reserved for the members of the Body. As to any whose heresy has never been manifested outwardly, Catholic theologians are not agreed whether they are to be reckoned as belonging to the Body of the Church. It is certain that they are subject to the jurisdiction of the Church, and may validly exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction, if they have any, but the same is true of open heretics, so that the question cannot be considered as decided by these principles, there has been no clear declaration upon it by the Church, nor do the Scripture or the Fathers speak decisively. On the one hand, it is said that he who has abandoned the faith has

broken the bond that united him to the unity of the Church, but it replied that the hidden heretic retains the outward profession of the faith and if Pope Eugenius IV. (Denz 599) and Pius IX (Denz 1502), when putting forward definitions of faith, declare that all who *think* otherwise have fallen from the Church, it is clear that these Pontiffs had no intention of settling the present controversy The chief argument on the other side is that the Visibility of the Church is impaired if any one is excluded for a hidden cause, to which it is answered that we have solid grounds for believing that secret heresy will never exist in the Church except in a very few instances. (See n. 192, VIII.) The opinion that favours the membership of hidden heretics recommends itself to most modern writers (See Murray, *De Ecclesia*, Disp. III. sect. 5, to whose list should be added Mazzella, *De Ecclesia*, d. 3, a 11, and Palmieri, *De Roman. Pont.* Proleg 11) On the other side we have the weighty authority of Suarez and Billuart

194 *Children of Heretics* —A question is sometimes mooted concerning the children of heretics, but it seems that it is easily answered on the principles that we have been considering Every infant becomes by Baptism a member both of the Soul of the Church and of the Body, and he retains this full membership until he do something to destroy it If in the course of years he come to hold heretical doctrine, however inculpably, and avows it, a misfortune befalls him, and his membership of the Body of the Church is severed, and this

is probably the case with most persons who are brought up in heretical communions Membership of the Soul of the Church is lost by grievous sin, and by this alone (n 184, IV)

195 *Catechumens* —Catechumens, or persons who have not been baptized, but are looking forward to receiving Baptism, and meantime are going through a course of training, certainly do not belong to the Body of the Church The necessity of Baptism as the entrance door of the Church was shown in n 188, and we may add that the same doctrine is taught by Pope Eugenius IV. in the Council of Florence (Denz 591) and by the Council of Trent (Sess 14, cap 2, Denz 775) The prayer of the Church for catechumens is that they may *become* of the number of her members (Service for Good Friday) and no doubt they reap spiritual benefit from their imperfect membership

The difficulties that are sometimes raised concerning the necessity of Baptism will be considered when we treat of that Sacrament

196. *Excommunication* —Excommunication is a spiritual punishment sometimes inflicted by the Church on one guilty of grave crimes, for the good of his soul or in vindication of the law. This censure deprives the person who has incurred it of the use of the Sacraments, of a share in public suffrages, and certain other spiritual privileges, and this deprivation endures until the censure is relaxed by competent authority It may happen that it has been inflicted unjustly, for the human judge who deals with the case is no way guaranteed against

error: or it may be that the censure was just, but the culprit has repented of his sin and been restored to the favour of God before he has procured the relaxation of the censure, but even in these cases the censure produces its effects, as is declared in the Bull *Unigenitus* (Prop 91, Denz 1306) against Quesnel, and the good providence of God can be trusted to hinder any real evil befalling him who incurs this undeserved loss Writers differ as to whether one who is under excommunication can be said to belong to the Body of the Church the names may be seen in Murray. (*De Eccles* Disp iii sect 8)

Excommunication is an act of the external court of the Church, dealing directly not with sin, but with crime. The full discussion of its nature and varieties belongs to Canon Law It is to be observed that though excommunication is not inflicted except in cases where grievous sin has been committed or is supposed to have been committed, yet it does not directly affect membership of the Soul of the Church: nothing but real grievous sin takes away this privilege or destroys the hopes founded in it. (See n 187)

197 *Schism* —Schism is explained by St. Thomas (*Summa Theol.* 2 2 q. 39 a 1) to be the act of one who wilfully withdraws himself from the obedience of the Roman Pontiff, the Vicar of Christ on earth, or who refuses to communicate with the members of the Church subject to him This withdrawal may be culpable, or through ignorance it may be inculpable, but in every case, one who has with-

drawn can no longer be said to belong to the Body of the Church This subject will recur when we speak of the unity of Government in the Church. (n. 224)

198 *Recapitulation* —In this chapter we have seen that they are members of the Soul of the Church who, having been justified, have not subsequently incurred the guilt of mortal sin; that Baptism, profession of the true faith, and communion with the Head and other members of the Church constitutes membership of the Body, so that the Body may be at once wider and narrower than the Soul; and we have dealt with certain difficulties and doubts that are raised on this subject.

CHAPTER IV.

CONSTITUTION AND POWERS OF THE CHURCH.

199 *Subject of Chapter.*—In this chapter we shall show that the Church is not a society all the members of which are on an equal footing, who arrange among themselves such distribution of offices as convenience may suggest, but that there is in it by Divine institution a certain form of government, and that they who share in the powers of this government owe their authority to the Founder, Christ, and not to appointment by those whom they govern. It will be shown that the powers of this government fall into three divisions, and particulars will be given as to one of these: the other two do not fall within the present Treatise.

The form of government established by Christ in the Church is monarchical, the Roman Pontiff being the Monarch; but this is a matter of so great importance that it will be convenient to reserve it for our next Treatise.

200 *Governors and Governed.*—Every society or collection of men, banded together for some particular purpose, must have some arrangement to secure that the members of the society so behave as to forward this purpose and not to frustrate it

If there be no such organization, nothing short of a perpetual miracle could so control the free-will of men as to save the society from failure in its object The Church is no exception to this rule, and it would be unable to do its office of continuing the work of King, Priest, and Prophet that Christ came on earth to do, except there were some distinction of governors and governed some members of the Church whose business was to direct others This is implied in the figures of a Kingdom and a Body, which, as we have seen (n 185), are used to represent the Church, and the idea is drawn out fully by St Paul in the twelfth chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians Also, we find the system in full operation from the beginning, for in the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles we constantly read of Apostles, Deacons, Prophets, Bishops, Ancients, Priests, Angels We are not now concerned with the nature of the offices denoted by these words or with the distinctions among them, their existence is beyond doubt, nor will it be denied that similar arrangements prevailed in post-Apostolic times, and continue to the present day.

201 *The Protestant Views.*—All the prominent sects of Protestants agree with Catholics in recognizing the necessity of some religious organization among Christians, but they differ in the names they give to their officials, and the extent of their jurisdiction Some are governed by Shepherds, a name which does not occur in the Scripture, but most prefer to select one or more of the names just quoted from the New Testament. Thus, in the

Established Church of England, with the kindred communions, we find the name of Bishops, and this name is also used by some of the Lutherans of the Continent and by certain branches of the Methodists. These Bishops rule a district containing many congregations. Other sects follow the "Presbyterian" model, where power is not confided to any individual, but is exercised by a representative assembly of "Elders" elected by each congregation: the word "Presbyter" having, according to them, the same meaning as "Elder." In others, again, there is no bond of common government uniting the distinct congregations, but each is "independent," and the "Elders" who manage its affairs have no authority elsewhere. The "Elders" are commonly elected by the "Church." The varieties of detail are endless, but, with the exception of some schools among the members of the Established Church, all agree in regarding the office-holders as the servants and not the masters of the community by whom they have been chosen. The sense in which the word "church" has just been used has been already explained. (n. 164.)

202. *Source of Authority.*—In opposition to all these, the Catholic Church holds that Christ Himself established a Hierarchy, or sacred form of government, which is essentially necessary to the existence of His Church. This doctrine is of faith, for the note of heresy attaches to the view put forward by the Council of Pistoia, to the effect that power to minister and rule flows to the pastors of the Church from the body of the faithful (*Auctorem Fidei*, 2,

Denz 1365), and the Bull *Unigenitus* condemned the teaching of Quesnel that the power of excommunication is exercised by the leading (or first) pastors, by the presumed consent of the whole body (n 90, Denz 1305)

The proof of our doctrine is taken from the Holy Scripture, and first from the Acts of the Apostles We there read that it was witnesses preordained of God that were commanded to preach (x 41, 42), that St Paul and St Barnabas, acting with the authority of Apostles, ordained Priests in every Church (xiv 22), that the Holy Spirit placed certain men as Bishops to rule the Church of God. (xx 28) Further, we read in the Epistles that God set some in the Church to be Apostles and for other functions (1 Cor xii 28, Ephes iv 11), and lastly, that St Paul left St Titus in Crete that he should set in order the things that were wanting, and ordain priests in every city. (Titus i 5) In all this, the work of government is done by men appointed by Christ or by His authority, there is not a trace of power being received by way of communication from the body of the faithful, nor is there any indication that the arrangement that we see in working order, with provision for its continuance, was intended to last for a time only, and to be replaced by a totally different scheme of government

There are certain texts from which some difficulties are raised against our doctrine (See Isaias liv 13, St Jerem xxxi 34, St John x 27, St James i 5, 1 St John ii, 20), but we remark (1) that the

Protestant interpretation of these texts is new, having no sanction in the older commentators, (2) that the texts were well-known to all concerned during many centuries, during which the Catholic doctrine was received unhesitatingly, (3) that this interpretation makes the Scripture self-contradictory, for the texts which we have adduced prove our doctrine plainly; (4) that it is an unsound method to interpret the clear by the light of the obscure; (5) that God is the First Cause of all things, and is often said in Scripture to do that which is really the effect of second causes, see, for instance, the 146th Psalm with its sequel, the 147th, where God is said to build Jerusalem, to cover the heaven with clouds, to fill His people with the fat of corn: all which effects came immediately from second causes, acting in virtue of the power and under the direction of the First Cause (6) that often, in Scripture, after the word "not" we must understand "only," and after "but" we must supply "chiefly" (*e.g.*, St Luke xiv. 12, 13) The application of these principles to the texts cited is easy.

203 *Authority to Teach.*—It is usual with theologians to distinguish a three-fold office in Christ, for He is Prophet, Priest, and King. This distinction has abundant basis in Scripture (see Deut. xviii. 15, Hebrews vii 26, Zach. ix 9); and we shall find it convenient to follow. for the same offices are continually exercised on earth by the Church The Church shares the kingship of Christ in the independence of all earthly control which is

her due, and which has been asserted by so many holy Pontiffs and Bishops who have suffered and still suffer obloquy, exile and death itself rather than surrender any part of the rights of the Church at the bidding of emperor or popular assembly The reason of this independence is that the end for which God established the Church, namely, the spiritual welfare of men, is not included in the end for which the same God established civil society, which is their temporal welfare. In virtue of this kingship, the Church has authority to make laws for the guidance of all who have become her subjects by receiving Baptism nor can these free themselves from this subjection by any act of their own The legislative power implies the power to pronounce judgment in cases of alleged breach of the law and to coerce the contumacious That the Church possesses these powers is unchangeable doctrine the mode of applying them belongs to changeable discipline, which varies with every variation in time, place, or circumstance But the full discussion of all that belongs to the kingship of the Church belongs to the canonists when they treat of public canon law (See, for example, Bouix, *De Papa*)

The priestly function of Christ is exercised by the Church in virtue of the Sacrament of Order, with which she has been entrusted. This Sacrament will be treated in its place.

The Prophetical or teaching office committed by Christ to His Church finds its proper place in the present Treatise, and we proceed to show that there

is in the Church authority to teach We have seen in the last section, that there is in the Church, by Divine institution, a distinction of governors and governed, and there being authority to teach, it is consistent that the governors are they who teach the governed, and thus we have the distinction of the Church as Teacher and the Church as Learner. We shall see in its proper place (n 208) that the Church as Teacher is constituted by the Bishops united with the Roman Pontiff. At present, it will suffice if we speak of teachers, without defining more particularly who they are

That the Church has authority to teach follows from what we have said upon her nature and office For the Church is the company of believers in Christ (n 166), and faith comes by hearing (Romans x. 14, 17); and there is to be one faith even as there is one Lord and one Baptism (Ephes iv. 5), which oneness of belief cannot be secured unless there is a judge of controversies who speaks intelligibly and whom all may obey but this judge cannot be the reason of each man which is weak and variable and has no binding force on the multitude nor is it the Christian people at large, for we nowhere find that such power has been given to them as the Apostles claimed for themselves (see especially 1 Cor. ix. 1, Ephes ii. 20) nor the head of the civil state, who has his own functions, but is within the Church as a Learner, nor, lastly, does it please God to settle controversies by revelations (n. 112), except perhaps by private revelations that avail no one but the receiver (n 22) The Scripture

is dead and cannot make its voice heard, and those who profess to be its expounders are at variance: there is no living voice but that of the Church that can be the judge of whose existence we are assured

This office of Teacher is exercised by the Church when the Supreme Pontiff addresses the whole Christian people by an Encyclical or otherwise, when a Bishop sends a pastoral to his flock, when the parish priest expounds the Gospel, in some sort, even when parents teach their children to pray, or when catechism is explained in the schools. And although certain portions of the teaching thus given, whether the teacher act by his own authority or by delegation from another, may be unsound, yet the promise of Christ that He will be with His Church all day (St Matt xxvm 20) assures us that the Learners will never, as a whole, fall away from the true faith

It belongs to the Teaching Church to note and condemn false doctrines as they are put forward: to take proper precautions to prevent the publication of books which will be harmful and to condemn injurious books which appear in spite of these precautions It does not belong to us to describe the mode and limitations under which these powers are exercised we will only remark that an approbation of a book by an ecclesiastical authority is quite consistent with a subsequent condemnation of the same book by the same authority, if further examination shows that what had been supposed to be harmless was really harmful and that books are condemned not merely because they contain false

doctrine, but sometimes because their publication is judged to be inexpedient on other grounds

The earliest case of the condemnation of a book by Church authority seems to be the case of the *Thalia* of the heretic Arius, which was condemned by the Council of Nice in 325 In this work, the author's views that the Word of God was a creature were "set forth in a loose, free style, reminding one of the works of Sotades" (Socrates, *H E* i 9, *P G* 67, 84.) The name of this Sotades, who was living in 280 B C, became a proverb among the heathen for all that is filthy, and the writer in Dr Smith's Dictionary says that he "carried his lascivious and abusive satires to the utmost lengths" Few will deny that the Council did well to condemn a book which treated of the most august mysteries of religion in a style which can be thus described

Besides all this, it is a part of the work of teaching to sanction and regulate the prayers and other devotions of the Christian people

204 *The Protestant System* —That the Church has authority to teach is admitted probably by all Protestants who hold that there is a visible Church in the world, but they do not admit that this teaching is infallible, and we need not be surprised that there is a want of distinctness in their utterances on the subject It does not concern us to discuss what is precisely held by them, but before we go on to establish the infallibility of the Catholic Church, as we shall do in the next section, it may be worth while to set forth the teaching of the Established Church of England on the subject

This is contained with much else in the Thirty-nine Articles, which are accepted by all ministers of the Establishment, the acceptance being renewed at each step in their profession Three of these run as follows

XIX *Of the Church*—The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached and the sacraments be duly administered according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.

As the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred, so also the Church of Rome has erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith

XX. *Of the Authority of the Church*—The Church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies and authority in matters of faith And yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's Word written; neither may it so expound one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another Wherefore, although the Church be a witness and keeper of Holy Writ, yet, as it ought not to decree anything against the same, so besides the same ought it not to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of salvation

XXI. *Of the Authority of General Councils*—General Councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of princes And when they be gathered together (forasmuch as they be an assembly of men whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God), they may err,

and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God. Wherefore, things ordained by them as necessary to salvation, have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they are taken out of Holy Scripture

These vague and self-contradictory Articles will plainly admit of being interpreted so as to be made consistent with almost any possible view on the matters of which they treat, except that they seem to exclude the notion that there is on earth any living voice or collection of living voices whose utterance on matters of faith is absolutely trustworthy on account of a Divine guarantee that they shall never err according to the Articles, the utterance of the living voice can do no more than suggest an inquiry as to the teaching of Scripture upon the point; and in the absence of any indication to the contrary it would seem that this inquiry is to be conducted by each private man on his own account and with the resources at his command. The function of the Church as represented by the Article would seem to be like that of St Paul when dealing with the Jewish inquirers at Beroea (Acts xvii. 10—12) The Apostle pointed out to his hearers in the Synagogue the places in the Old Testament which proved that Jesus was the Christ, and they are praised for verifying his references and considering the interpretations that he proposed The result was that they believed and doubtless were baptized, and in enjoining Baptism, St Paul enforced something to be believed for necessity of salvation besides what was in Scripture, for the

Old Testament is silent on the subject and the New did not yet exist that is to say, St Paul did not act on the principle of the Articles, proposing his teaching as something to be tested by Scripture, but he proposed it by his own authority, having previously satisfied his hearers that what he taught came to them with the authority of God Himself that is to say, his position was the position taken by the Catholic Church, and by it alone, at the present day (See n 89)

205 *The Church Infallible* —That the Catholic Church claims not merely to have received a commission to teach, but also to be divinely guaranteed from error, will not be seriously denied by any one, in spite of its being true that no express definition has been made upon the subject. There are other ways beside express declaration by which the mind of a society, no less than that of an individual, can be manifested a declaration is implied as often as conduct is adopted which cannot be explained except upon the understanding that the matter is as supposed Parliament has never expressly declared its own competence to legislate, and if such a declaration were made it would itself be a piece of legislation, the authority of which would be admitted by no man who was not already prepared to admit the legislative power of Parliament. But the declaration is implied in every statute which speaks imperatively, and in fitting cases imposes penalties and even death, while no word is found that implies any doubt upon the subject

In like manner, the Church has never indicated

that she entertains the slightest doubt of her own infallibility; and she has used expressions that are inconsistent with the notion that she is capable of error in her teaching Thus the Synod of Pistoia (see n 182) taught that in these latter times a general obscuration has come on touching religion and the bases of faith and morals, and this doctrine is condemned by Pope Pius VI as heretical (*Auctorem Fidei*, prop 1, Denz 1364) And the Vatican Council (Sess 4, cap 4, Denz 1682), while clearly defining the infallibility of the Sovereign Pontiff, found no better way to express the doctrine than by saying that he enjoys the same infallibility as that with which our Divine Saviour has been pleased to endow His Church The same follows from the strong terms in which all are condemned who refuse to accept any part of the teaching of the Church, as may be seen in most of the dogmatic decrees in Denzinger, this language would not be used by one who felt conscious that an appeal to Scripture or to some other authority might after all show that those who were condemned were really in the right (See Denzinger, n 1, 375, 1683, *et alibi passim*) We must not be supposed to maintain that because the Church claims Infallibility therefore she is infallible None but the Divine Founder could give this gift, and we must look to His recorded words for the proof that He has given it. Words to this effect are found in two places of St Matthew's Gospel (xvi 18 and xxviii 20) and in one of St John (xvi 16—20), to which may be added the expression used by St Paul in his First Epistle to St Timothy (iii 14, 15) We will

shortly discuss these in order, and in a future paragraph (n 207) notice the chief heads of objection that are brought against this fundamental point of our doctrine and its proof, but first we must make a remark upon a difficulty which sometimes imposes on the unthinking, it is said that we have no right to use the Scripture to prove the Church, for we have already maintained (n 150) that we need the Church to prove the Scriptures The answer is short we use the Church to prove that the Scriptures are the inspired Word of God, and we prove the Church by the Scriptures regarded as trustworthy human histories, and so to the vaunted vicious circle which even a writer like Burnet, for many years the standard authority (*On the Articles*, XIX), was not ashamed to use, turns out to be a pointless shaft We have therefore a right to quote St Matthew and the rest

206 *Proofs of Infallibility.*—I. St Matt XVI. 18 Christ addressed St Peter, "I say unto thee, that thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it" We are not here concerned with the address to St Peter, nor with any question as to what was the Rock on which the Church was to be built, these matters will come before us again when we treat of the Roman Pontiff (n 274) We need only observe that to build upon a rock certainly implies the stability of the building (St Matt VII 24), and that "gates" are often used for the seat of power and government (Psalm CXXVI 5, Isaias XXXVIII 10), much as we say "the Court" We have then the

assurance that the Church is like a city which is firmly built and which may be besieged by the enemy but will never be captured, for God Himself is vigilant in the defence (Psalm cxxvi 1) The enemy is the lord of Hell, Satan, and if he could succeed in seducing the Church, which is put on earth to witness to the truth of God and teach it, and leading it to falsehood, then it must be admitted that he has been successful in overthrowing the firm walls, and destroying the city. The testimonies of the Fathers, showing the sense they put on this and the following texts, will be found in Waterworth's *Faith of Catholics*, or in the Commentators, and it is needless to copy them into these pages

II St Matt. xxviii 20. Christ, when on the point of leaving this earth, addressed His Apostles, "Teaching them [all nations] to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and behold, I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world"

On this text we have first to consider the force of the words, "be with you." The phrase is of very frequent occurrence in Scriptures, and Dr Murray (*De Ecclesia*, Disp xi sect ii nn 66—70) has collected no less than ninety places of the Old and New Testament where it occurs, and by comparing these its exact force can be determined with safety. Only a few specimens can be referred to in these pages. Sometimes, as in our text, God promises to be "with" a person while engaged on some work, and this implies that the work will certainly be performed (Josue i. 5), sometimes we

have statement that God is "with" some one, and this implies a conviction that he will succeed in his undertaking (Genesis xxxix 2), or prayer is made to God that He will be "with" a certain person, to secure him success (Romans xv 33), and on the other hand, the negative form that God is "not with" a person is equivalent to an assertion that he will fail (Numbers xiv 42) This usage is absolutely unbroken, there not being a single text to which a contrary meaning can be given, and there being one only which can even be considered neutral (Ruth ii 4), where the words, "The Lord be with you," may be regarded as a common form of salutation, without any definite force as a prayer From this usage we conclude that the persons addressed in the text would be successful in their work of teaching, which success is inconsistent with their teaching error

A further question remains as to the duration of this assistance, in other words, as to what is meant by the words translated "the consummation of the world" Some have attempted to cut down the word represented by "world" to the lifetime of the Apostles But there is nothing to suggest such a limitation, which is contrary to the usage of the same St Matthew, in places (xiii 39, 40, 49, xxiv 3) where the very same words are employed and where the meaning is unmistakeable We decline, therefore, to believe that there was to be an infallible living voice on earth for a few years after the Ascension of our Lord, and that then, on the death of an old man, the whole economy of the

Church was to be suddenly changed, and a new method of ascertaining truth to be substituted, and that this fundamental change was to come about without a hint of anything of the sort being given in the records of Revelation

III. St John xiv. 16—26 Christ addresses His Apostles for the last time before His Death The whole passage may be referred to, but it will be enough to give the commencement and the close "I shall ask the Father, and He shall give you another Paraclete, that He may abide with you for ever, the Spirit of Truth, Whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth Him not, nor knoweth Him, but you shall know Him because He shall abide with you and shall be in you . The Paraclete Whom the Father shall send in My Name, He will teach you all things, and bring all things to your mind whatsoever I shall have said to you."

Here we have the promise of some gift—the nature of which does not concern us in this place—the possessors of which gift will not be liable to error as to the doctrine which Christ taught This promise is made immediately to the Apostles, but the gift is to remain with them "for ever," a phrase which there is no reason to cut down to anything less than its popular meaning, and it is given to them, as opposed to the world, for the world cannot receive it, which word "world" is repeatedly used by our Lord for all who do not believe in Him (St John xv. 19; xvii 9, 25, &c) It follows that the believers in Christ will be collectively preserved

for ever from error as to His doctrine, in other words, that the Church is infallible in teaching

IV 1 Timothy iii 14, 15 St Paul writes to St Timothy "These things I write to thee, hoping that I shall come to thee shortly But if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of truth"

In the following verse the Apostle sums up the chief heads of Christian doctrine Here the Church is distinctly called the pillar and ground of truth, for the Greek original will not allow these words to be applied to God only, as the reader of the English version might incline to think possible. It is scarcely necessary to prove that the figure of a pillar implies unshaken firmness, but Scripture authority is forthcoming if wanted, as when God made the Prophet Jeremias a fortified city and a pillar of iron and a wall of brass (Jerem 1 18, see also Apoc. iii 12) These three equivalent figures cannot be misunderstood. The word (ἑδραίωμα) translated "ground" in our text does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament, but a closely kindred word is the second of those (τεθελεμιωμένοι καὶ ἑδραῖοι) used by St. Paul in writing to the Colossians, which are translated "grounded and settled" (Coloss 1 23), where again the meaning is beyond doubt Now, a body which taught falsehood could not be said to be the unshaken support of truth, so again we are led to the conclusion that the Church is infallible

We are forced to omit an immense amount of

proof and illustration that has been gathered by divines when treating on this subject, and we can only add one argument drawn from theological reason. We have seen (n 203) that the Church has authority to teach given her by God, and to this authority corresponds a duty on the part of her members to receive her teaching, for without this correlative duty the word authority is meaningless But God cannot have imposed upon man any duty to receive and accept falsehood Hence the Divine veracity is concerned to see that the authorized teacher does not go astray

207. *Objections against Infallibility* —The all-important point that has just been discussed, that Christ left on earth a Church to which is granted a Divine assurance of immunity from error in her teaching has naturally been the principal battle-ground in all controversy between the Church and the sects which arose in the sixteenth century, and which were the first to call this Infallibility in question. Objections against the Catholic doctrine have been put forward in immense variety, and sometimes with much subtlety by a great number of writers, and some of these have found much currency, and form, as it were, a great part of the ordinary stock in trade of Protestant controversialists It would be out of place, even if space permitted, to set forth all these objections in a work of which the main purpose is not polemical, but expository, and it will be enough again to refer the reader to the great work of Dr Murray, *De Ecclesia* It is not the least of the services that the learned

author has rendered to Theology that he has searched the whole body of controversial literature and collected in a short form all the objections that he finds, together with the answers They fall under no less than seventy heads, and many of these are urged in various shapes As soon as the difficulty is exhibited shortly in syllogistic form it can be understood and dealt with, a great part of the skill of a disputant being shown in discovering the morsel of meaning which his adversary wraps up in a cloud of words, but which often turns out to be a very trifle when set forth in the shape which alone is admitted by logicians to be conclusive, and which alone is in use in Catholic schools of Theology (See in the Appendix a specimen of a Disputation carried on upon these lines) We will make a few remarks which, taken together with what we have said already in various places, will furnish a key to most of the difficulties thus laboriously got together by Dr. Murray; some, however, must be reserved for the sixth Treatise on Faith

First, then, some objectors seem to hold in fact, though not in terms, that God *could* not establish an infallible Church, but they fail to show what contradiction is involved in the idea Others say that such an institution would be harmful, destroying reason and cramping research, as if a man were not free if he pleased to reject teaching, even if he recognizes that it comes to him on authority which he cannot deny, and as if research were cramped whenever it was provided with an accession to the

stock of undisputable truths Others think that if they had established an infallible Church, they would have arranged it better than Christ has done, pitting their wisdom against the wisdom of God They would have the Church at once infallibly declare her whole message, forgetting the province of prudence in regulating the times for producing things new and old (St Matt xiii 52) Others again say that the Church has in fact failed, for errors have arisen, as if the power of a perverse will did not remain with man, and some urge that the whole Church has failed, quoting the expression of St Jerome that, after the Council of Rimini in 359, the whole world found with surprise that it had fallen into the Arian heresy (*Dial adv Luciferianos*, n. 19, *P L.* 23, 172), but not seeing that this phrase is merely a rhetorical or perhaps humorous exaggeration (see similar instances in Scripture, St John xii 19, xxi 25), and whatever was the spirit of the remark, it certainly was not true, as may be seen by reference to the histories of the period (See particularly Jungmann, Diss in *Hist Eccles* vii) If it be said that the Catholic Church practically disclaims infallibility as often as her Popes and Councils admit the aid of private theologians to help their deliberations as to the faith, this merely shows that the gift given to the Church is not inspiration, but merely a Divine security that her governors shall not err in the application of their human prudence, and this prudence teaches those concerned to inform themselves of the true tradition by all available means, among which high

places are held by the Holy Scripture and by the feeling that prevails among the laity. St Paul addressing the clergy gathered at Miletus (Acts xx 28, seq) gave them such instructions as he judged to be suitable and sufficient to secure them in the troublous times that he foresaw; and they who urge that he would have referred them to an infallible authority, had he believed such to exist on earth, forget that they were already instructed Christians who did not need to be reminded of the elementary truths of the faith, and that some of the Apostles themselves were still living and were infallible according to most theologians even among Protestants (See Galat i 8)

This must suffice The objections that are taken against our Scripture proofs are chiefly founded on arbitrary additions to the text, as when the promise of Christ to be with His Apostles is confined to assistance in teaching by writing the Scriptures, a restriction of which the Evangelist gives no indication (St Matt xxviii 20.) Some suggestions that may be useful in this part of the controversy are given in nn 192, VIII , 205, and elsewhere.

208 *Seat of Infallibility* —The subject of the seat of infallibility in the Church cannot be adequately discussed until we have established the doctrine concerning the Roman Pontiff, which forms the subject of our next Treatise A few remarks may, however, be made The Church has been shown to be infallible in the work of teaching (n 203), and the work of teaching belongs to the

governing body of the Church, the Hierarchy (n. 206), it follows from this that the governed, the Church as Learners, is not the seat of infallibility, but that nevertheless we have an assurance that the Learners will never as a whole fall from the faith, for this would imply the failure of the Teachers in their work. Hence these Teachers are the proper seat of infallibility, but not the whole of them, for history and experience prove that not only do individuals among them make shipwreck of the faith, but at times a large part of the clergy of entire provinces have lapsed, as happened in the days of the Donatist schism, in southern France in the twelfth century, and in various parts of northern Europe at the time of the Reformation History further shows that simple priests, whether charged with the care of parishes or not, have never been considered as ranking with Bishops as judges of the faith, and the doctrine according to which they have in virtue of their ordination a right to judge, is condemned as at least erroneous by Pope Pius VI (*Auctorem Fidei*, 10, Denz 1373)

It remains that the Catholic episcopate, whether dispersed or united in a General Council, are a seat of infallibility, and it will be shown in the next Treatise that one condition of the status of each individual Catholic Bishop is that he is in communion with the See of Rome When this has been established, something more will be said about General Councils (n. 297), but it may be useful to add in this place that no school of Catholic theology

has ever doubted that the morally universal agreement of the Catholic Bishops is a voice of the infallible Church

209 *Extent of Infallibility*.—Having established that the Church is infallible in its teaching, and having said something as to the seat of this privilege, we now come to the interesting question of its extent, and for the answer to this question we must look to the words and actions of the Church herself. Every supreme tribunal of whatever kind must necessarily have authority to define the limits of the matter with which it is competent to deal, for by supposition there is no one to set the tribunal right if it exceed due limits, the Church therefore, being supreme in spiritual matters, has authority to teach what are the bounds of her authority, just as in the English system of law the House of Lords is competent to declare what are the matters with which it is competent to deal, and since her teaching is infallible, she is infallible in declaring the bounds of her own infallibility. Were it otherwise, the supreme tribunal might be mocked by any delinquent who questioned its competence to deal with his case

We must then look to the matters on which the Church has taught the Christian world, and we observe that this teaching may be done by action no less than by word of mouth We are not concerned with the prudence of all her actions, though we believe that on the whole she is prudent in a degree which cannot but be supernatural, nor do we hold that she can be said to teach doctrine

by every act of administration, so that if a certain privilege or dispensation was granted in a few stray instances these would not necessarily prove that this grant was within the competence of the Church, but if these grants were made habitually, as often as a proper case came before the courts, we should have proof that the grant was not beyond the scope of ecclesiastical power

210. *Faith and Morals.*—In the first place then, the Church is infallible in defining points of faith or morals; for the revealed doctrine which is the object of faith is the direct matter which she is placed on earth to teach, and the distinction of morals from faith is made for convenience only, for the unlawfulness of certain conduct is as much a matter of belief as are the articles of the Creed This teaching may be exercised in the affirmative way, as when the Council of Nice defined that the Word of God is consubstantial with the Father, and when Pope Pius IX defined that our Lady was conceived without being subject to original sin, or in the negative way, by condemning certain propositions, which condemnation, at least if the note of heresy be affixed, amounts to an infallible definition that the contradictory is true; this method has been in frequent use since the early part of the fifteenth century, as may be seen in Denzinger. So far there is agreement among all who profess to be Catholics, although there is much difference of opinion concerning the precise effect of some of the notes of condemnation which have been used from time to time. (See n 328)

But the infallibility of the Church is not confined to those matters which have been revealed, it extends to other truths without assurance of which it would be impossible or very difficult to preserve the deposit of faith, and the Vatican Council (Sess 3 can 4), pronounces an anathema against all who maintain that branches of human learning may be pursued with liberty to maintain the truth of assertions, even if opposed to revealed doctrine, and that the Church is powerless to condemn these assertions (Denz 1664), the reason being that a proposition of philosophy, for instance, may be so closely connected with revealed doctrine that a true act of faith in what is revealed will be impossible for one who errs in the natural science

211 *Dogmatic Facts*—But besides these speculative truths, there are certain matters of fact concerning which the Church can judge with infallible certainty These are called by many writers dogmatic facts, although others use this expression only of one class among them, which was much discussed in the course of the controversy with the Jansenists in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries These heretics were anxious to keep the name of Catholic, and finding their doctrine on grace condemned by the Church, endeavoured to escape from the condemnation by showing that the Church had misunderstood their writings, to which it was replied that the infallibility of the Church extended to the determination of the true sense conveyed by a form of words, and the phrase

"dogmatic fact" was little heard of except in regard to such determinations

We will proceed to mention some dogmatic facts, in the wider sense, adding the reason why we hold that they come within the infallible authority of the Church. But it must be remembered that if the Church speak on any of these matters, it does not follow that she has exercised her infallibility, she may have intended to exert a merely disciplinary authority alone (n 203), regulating the outward conduct only, but not touching men's inward belief The doubt that may sometimes arise in particular cases must be solved by considering the terms and circumstances of the utterance In this part of the subject we are not writing controversially, at least as regards those who do not acknowledge the authority of the Holy See; we are merely stating the Catholic doctrine.

First, then, the Church is infallible when she declares what person holds the office of Pope, for if the person of the Pope were uncertain, it would be uncertain what Bishops were in communion with the Pope, but according to the Catholic faith, as will be proved hereafter, communion with the Pope is a condition for the exercise of the function of teaching by the body of Bishops (n 208), if then the uncertainty could not be cleared up, the power of teaching could not be exercised, and Christ's promise (St Matt. xxviii 20, and n 199, II.) would be falsified, which is impossible

This argument is in substance the same as applies to other cases of dogmatic facts. Also, it

affords an answer to a much vaunted objection to the claims of the Catholic Church, put forward by writers who think that they find proof in history that the election of a certain Pope was simoniacal and invalid, and that the successor was elected by Cardinals who owed their own appointment to the simoniacal intruder, from which it is gathered that the Papacy has been vacant ever since that time. A volume might be occupied if we attempted to expose all the frailness of the argument which is supposed to lead to this startling conclusion; but it is enough to say that if the Bishops agree in recognizing a certain man as Pope, they are certainly right, for otherwise the body of the Bishops would be separated from their head, and the Divine constitution of the Church would be ruined

In just the same way the infallibility extends to declaring that a certain Council is or is not ecumenical, that certain systems of education are, or are not, injurious to faith and morals, that the principles of certain societies are immoral, and that certain ways of life, especially in Religious Orders, are not merely free from moral evil, but are laudable Unless the Church could judge upon these matters, she could not exercise her office of guiding and instructing her members.

The matters of Beatification and Canonization require a few words more of explanation The great authority on the whole subject is the work of Pope Benedict XIV *De Canonizatione*, from which the late Dr Faber took the matter of the Essay which served as a kind of preface to the Oratory

series of Lives of the Saints (Faber, *Essay on Beatification*, &c.) It is enough to say here that sometimes the Holy See, after suitable investigation, pronounces a solemn judgment that the virtue of a deceased person was heroic (n. 231), and that God has testified to his sanctity by miracles worked by his intercession, and then it is accustomed to declare that the person may be publicly allowed the title of "Blessed," and that Mass and Office may be said in his honour within certain limits of place, or by certain classes of persons. If after an interval it is judged that God has been pleased to show by further miracles His approval of what has been done, then a further decree may be issued by which the Pontiff defines that the person is a "Saint," and is to be honoured as such in the whole Church with public worship. No writer of repute doubts that this last decree of Canonization is an exercise of the infallible authority of the Church, for were it mistaken, the whole Church would be led into offering superstitious worship, but there is a controversy as to whether this same can be alleged of Beatification, for this decree is in a manner reviewed in the subsequent process. We have no space to enter into the arguments on both sides of this question, and will only remark that on every view the decree of Beatification commands at least the respect of all the faithful, as being the deliberate judgment of the common Father. If any one be inclined to scoff at the process by which the miracles are established in these cases, he may be referred to the records of the causes, where he

will see the scrupulous care with which the evidence is scrutinized (See n 255)

Lastly, the Church's infallible authority extends to determining the true sense conveyed by forms of speech, whether solitary words, or propositions, or books, and this without reference to the meaning intended by the author, of which in general the Church does not judge This is the class of cases to which the name of dogmatic facts is more particularly applied. The exercise of this power by the Church has in all ages been most distasteful to all who have wished to retain the character of being Catholic, at the same time that they are wanting in the spirit of hearty interior submission to the living teacher, and statesmen who care little about truth and much about peace, join in protesting against what they represent as undue insistence on mere words. Thus the Arians of the fourth century, in conjunction with the Emperor Constantius, protested against the Catholics who insisted on their acceptance of the word "consubstantial," which the Council of Nice had used in defining the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity, they wished, they said, to use no words not found in Scripture, novel words, but the Catholics replied by asking whether newly-discovered poisons might not render necessary novel drugs as antidotes (St Hilar *Contra Constantium*, n 15, 16, *P L* 10, 594), and since that day the disputed word has held its place in the Catholic Creed In the same way, the Council of Trent (Sess 13, can 2, Denz 764) defined that the word Transubstantiation was most fit to apply to the

change of the elements in the Eucharist, and the Synod of Pistoia, which raised objections similar to those just quoted from the Arians, and would have omitted the word, was condemned by Pope Pius VI. (*Auctorem Fidei*, prop 29, Denz 1392) on the ground that the word was consecrated by the Church for the defence of the faith against heresies The controversy with the Jansenists turned partly on the question whether the Church had authority to declare that the famous five propositions were contained in the book written by Jansenius, this was felt to be the central point of the whole matter, for if the Church could not determine the meaning of language she would be powerless to teach ner only medium of instruction is human language For an account of this mortal contest, the reader must go to the historians. (See Jungmann, Diss in *Hist Eccles* Diss XL.) At the present day, Jansenism as a heresy no longer exists, at least in any conspicuous form, but the spirit of Jansenism, which wishes to claim Catholic communion without submission of mind and will to the hierarchical Church, still shows itself frequently in various forms

212 *Recapitulation* — In this long chapter we have shown that there is in the Church by Divine appointment a hierarchy of governors, who have, among other functions, authority to teach the members of the Church, and this with Divine guarantee that they will not err The difficulties that are raised against this doctrine were discussed, it was shown that though the laity are not the teachers, yet from the faith of the laity the faith of

the teachers may be inferred, that the seat of the infallible authority cannot be fully explained until the doctrine concerning the Roman Pontiff has been established, and finally it was shown that the authority extended to certain matters which though not actually revealed, are yet closely connected with Revelation.

CHAPTER V.

UNITY OF THE CHURCH.

213. *Subject of Chapter.*—So far we have been discussing elements which may be considered as constituting the essence of the Church We proceed now to discuss certain properties of the same supernatural society, among which the first place will be assigned to that Unity which is ascribed to the Church in the Nicene Creed

214 *Properties of the Church* —The word Property is used by logicians to signify something which is always found to accompany another thing, without however being conceived as essential to that thing Thus, to use the common illustration, the essence of "man" is to be a rational animal every man is a rational animal, and every rational animal is a man But further, to be capable of laughter belongs to all men and to men alone, and yet we do not see any intrinsic reason why this power should be found in every rational animal, and in no other This being so, capability of laughing is said to be a property of man

Whatever may be thought of the example, it serves to illustrate the sense which is attached to the word, and so, when we speak of the properties

of the Church, we have to look for something that is found in this society and in none other, but which does not seem obviously to result from the position occupied by the society of being the instrument by which the work begun on earth by Christ is to be carried on and applied to individual men It is in this sense that it is usual to speak of four properties as possessed by the Church · Unity, Sanctity, Catholicity, and Apostolicity ; and these are sometimes spoken of loosely as essential to the Church, inasmuch as the Church can never be without any of them In the present chapter we shall speak of the first of these, and show how and in what sense the Church of Christ is One The three chapters that follow will deal with the remaining properties, and the closing chapter of the Treatise will point out the way in which these properties afford the means of determining which among the various communions that profess the Name of Christ is that Church which He founded and which He endowed with the magnificent prerogatives that we have described in previous chapters

Keen controversies exist as to all this branch of our subject, and many points will arise which are felt to be absolutely vital Our proofs will be gathered mainly from the Scriptures, the authority of which is acknowledged by all our adversaries we shall also use history and the witness of the Fathers, for many whom we oppose ascribe weight to these authorities

215 *Catholic Doctrine on Unity* —It will be convenient to begin with a short statement of the

elements which make up the idea of the Unity or Oneness, which is a property of the Church It is not only that there is only one Church in the world, one society only through membership of which salvation is to be attained, and attained the more easily the fuller and more perfect is the union of the individual with the society (See nn 165, 181, 187) It is true that in this sense the Church is One or Unique but this is far from being the only sense There may be a man alone in a certain place, but to say this does not describe the oneness of his nature this is found in the way in which the various powers of the soul and members of the body work together for one end there is a common principle giving a character to the whole, and the influence of which sharply distinguishes the man from all things of what kind soever that are not he There is variety in the members, but there is some thing common to them all The Church, in like manner, has a principle of oneness, which joins the members together, and distinguishes the society from a mere aggregate of unconnected units The members are associated in order that, believing the revelation which God has given, and using the means of grace which He has provided under the direction of the governors who have their authority from Him, they may attain the end of their being, the salvation of their souls In other words, the Unity which the Church must have includes Unity of Faith, Unity of Worship, and Unity of Government It will be observed that we still say nothing as to the form of this government, whether monar-

chical or otherwise, but that the society may be One it is necessary that it should be ruled by one supreme government

216. *Schism*.—The state and sin of Schism are so closely connected with that Unity which we are about to prove to be a property of the Church that it may be well to say something about it in this place. The word "schism" signifies cleaving (σχίζω, to split), but it is perhaps not used except in its ecclesiastical sense, or in senses derived from this. Thus we sometimes hear that a schism has occurred in some political organization, the meaning being that a portion of the members of the association have withdrawn from the profession of obedience to the managers, and ceased to co-operate with the rest. The cause of the division may be some dispute as to the genuine principles of the party, or as to the best means of promoting them, or it may, and often does, arise from offence being taken at what seems arbitrary conduct on the part of those in authority. Whenever such a separation happens, complaints are heard from both sides of the damage done to the cause by the split, and there is plenty of recrimination, as each side throws the blame upon the other; but impartial bystanders, even though they understand little of the nature and merits of the dispute, generally have little trouble in telling which of the two disputants is the original and which is the secession. What is here said of political parties is also frequently observed in the history of religious sects, the multitudinous forms of Presbyterianism and Methodism having originated

in a series of secessions from the Scotch Kirk and the Wesleyan body.

The Emperor Aurelian was a bystander when in the year 272 he was appealed to in an action of ejectment brought by the clergy of Antioch against Paul of Samosata, who had previously been Bishop, but had been deposed for heresy He refused to surrender possession of the church house, until compelled to do so by the authority of the Emperor, whose judgment is that the house belonged to those with whom the Bishops of Italy and Rome corresponded. (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl* 7, 30, *P G* 20, 720, and see n. 213 as to Commendatory Letters.) In this way, as the historian remarks, Paul was turned out of the church in most disgraceful fashion by the secular power (*κοσμικὴ ἀρχή*) The word which is here rendered "correspond with" often means "give orders to" (*ἐπιστέλλω*)

The word Schism is used frequently in St John's Gospel, to describe the different views that were taken by parties among the Jews as to the true character of the Mission of our Lord (see St John vii 43; ix 16, x. 19, &c, the literal sense is in St Matt. ix 16), but it does not appear that these were more than passing differences of opinion. The ecclesiastical use of the word appears to be founded on a passage of St Paul to the Corinthians, namely, 1 Cor i 10 St Paul is writing to the members of the Christian community, which owed its origin to his preaching, and he beseeches them by the name of the Lord Jesus Christ that they all speak the same thing, and that there be no schisms among

them, and he speaks thus earnestly, in the very opening of his letter, because it had been signified to him that there were contentions among them These contentions went so far that the parties took to themselves the names of leaders of whom they professed themselves to be in a special manner the disciples, some were of Paul, some of Apollos, some of Cephas, while others professed to be of Christ Nothing is known as to the true nature of these dissensions, though much has been written about them, and huge theories built up upon most narrow foundations some account will be found in Conybeare and Howson's *Life of St Paul*, in the thirteenth chapter We may remark that it seems that the factions really took the names that are mentioned, and that these names are not inserted by St. Paul in order to save the credit of the true leaders This is the opinion held by St Augustine (*De Baptismo contra Donatistas*, 5, 13 [15], *P L* 43, 184), and the Latins in general, against St Chrysostom (Hom 12 in 1 Cor , *P G* 61, 95) and other Greeks, who think that the precaution that St Paul mentions (1 Cor iv 6) as taken by him extends to the whole of the earlier part of the Epistle, whereas it is well explained as referring only to the five preceding verses (See Cornely's Commentary in the *Cursus Scripturæ Sacræ*) The chief argument for the Latin view is founded on a passage of the first Epistle of St Clement to the Corinthians, chapter xlvii This writer can scarcely have been mistaken on the subject, writing as he did a very few years after the date of St Paul's letter, and his reasoning would

have no force if the view of the Greeks be adopted (*P G.* I, 308) That these assumptions of party names were not countenanced by the leaders whose names were employed, is proved, if proof be needed, by the terms in which St Paul mentions Apollos in this very Epistle (xvi 12) One party called themselves by the name of Christ, and there is a curious parallel to this exclusiveness in the use of the name Evangelical by some sects of the present day, as though they had a monopoly of the Gospels Since the members of these parties are clearly among the number of those to whom the Epistle is addressed, and who are spoken of collectively with commendation (I. 4—9), we gather that no complete and formal separation had taken place, and indeed it could scarcely have occurred so long as the parties had no true leaders. it follows that the emphatic protests of the Apostle were elicited by the existence of a spirit which gave rise to a danger of actual schism

We have schism from the Church in the fullest sense in the case of heresy, which severs the person professing it from the membership of the Church (n. 193), but the formal sin of schism is as it were merged in the yet greater sin of heresy, and ever if the sins are material only, through ignorance, the state of heresy is more disastrous than even the state of schism, so that the word Schismatic is seldom used of one who is also a heretic, whether formal or material The sin of schism specially so called is committed by one who, being baptized, by a public and formal act renounces subjection to the

governors of the Church, also by one who formally and publicly takes part in any public religious worship which is set up in rivalry to that of the Church. It is not an act of schism to refuse obedience to a law or precept of the Supreme Pontiff or other ecclesiastical Superior, provided this refusal does not amount to a disclaimer of all subjection to him, nor even then, if there be any doubt of his authority, as when two or more persons have plausible claims to the position; but formal schism may be committed by one who claims to exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction which has not been conferred upon him by proper authority.

217 *The Donatists*.—The nature of schism is well illustrated by the history of the rise of the Donatist party, and by what is called the Great Schism. A very short sketch of each must suffice; and first of the Donatists

In the year 311, Mensurius, Archbishop of Carthage, died on his return from Rome, whither he had been called to answer a charge made against him by the Emperor His death becoming known, an election was held, when Cæcilian was chosen and consecrated by Felix of Aptunga. This election was highly displeasing, on private grounds, to many influential persons in Africa, who determined to set it aside, and they procured the assistance in their scheme of a considerable body of bishops belonging to the adjoining province of Numidia. These bishops met together, and declared the ordination of Cæcilian null, on the ground that Felix had been guilty of surrendering the Sacred Scriptures at the command

of Diocletian (see n 133), which crime, they contended, cut him off from the communion of the Church; and it was further alleged that Cæcilian had been elected before the arrival of the bishops of Numidia, whose presence was necessary. After pronouncing the decree of deposition, the assembly proceeded to elect one of their own party, Majorinus, to fill the vacant see Majorinus dying was succeeded by Donatus, from whom the party took its name.

So far there is nothing in the history to show conclusively which party was in the right but the next steps dispelled all doubt The question between Cæcilian and Majorinus was brought before the Pope St Melchiades and a council of a few bishops summoned by him and after hearing the parties, sentence was pronounced in favour of Cæcilian. Even this was not conclusive, even for those who admit the supreme authority of the Holy See, for a personal question like this differs from a question of faith: the decision may be reheard and the judgment reversed. The Pope finding that the defeated party did not acquiesce, had the whole matter again gone into, at a Council held at Arles, before a larger and more representative assembly of bishops. The decision was again in favour of Cæcilian, and the whole Christian world outside the two provinces in which the dispute had arisen recognized this decision as final. From that time the schism was complete. and there was no room for doubt whether the name of schismatic was to be given to a knot of bishops holding sees within

a stretch of some two hundred and fifty miles along the north coast of what we call Africa, or whether, as these alleged, they, and they alone, were the true Church, and the rival Bishops of Carthage and the neighbourhood, together with the Bishops of Rome and of all the rest of the world, were cut off from membership The Donatists soon added to their schism the heresy of denying Church-membership to sinners the sect existed for about a century, and then died out

218 *The Great Schism* —What is rightly called the "Great Schism" had a different history, for although there was undoubtedly a schism, yet to this day there is no ground for an absolute judgment which party were the schismatics The division lasted from 1378 to 1417 In the former year, the Holy See being vacant, a *de facto* election was held by the Cardinals but they soon repented of their choice, and declaring that they had acted under fear of a seditious rising of the Roman populace, they proceeded to a second election, choosing another person The names are omitted here, for they are apt to bring confusion into a history which in its main features is sufficiently simple This double election resulted in there being two claimants for the Papacy, each of whom obtained a considerable following, and there was no short and easy means of determining which was the rightful Pope Each had a line of successors, and for a while there were three claimants, in consequence of another double election in one of the lines: and this deplorable state of things continued until the year

1417, when, during the Council of Constance, the moment came for holding an undisputed election, all the rival lines happened to be without a head at the same time: the Holy See was, therefore, undoubtedly vacant, and Pope Martin V was duly chosen, and recognized on all hands with an insignificant exception. This put an end to a state of things during which there was wide-spread schism, involving perhaps half of the Catholic world, but the schism was material only, resulting from the presence of insoluble doubt as to the person of the Pontiff. No one renounced the principle of obedience to the Pope, so soon as he should be known.

No authorities are quoted here for these histories, because they have been narrated only for the purpose of illustrating the nature of Schism. There probably is not much room for controversy as to the facts that have been mentioned in these bare outlines. The whole matter should be considered in connection with the Catholicity of the Church. (chapter VII.)

219. *Errors as to Unity.*—The errors opposed to the Catholic doctrine of the Unity of the Church fall into two classes. There are some who maintain the necessity of absolute unity of faith, and are ready fully to acknowledge the infallible authority of the Church in defining articles of faith, and to regard as heretics all who question anything which has been so defined: but they are content with this, and believe that the Church may be split into several communions which, while they agree in

holding the defined faith, disagree as to worship and government and they hold that this state of things is actually existing, and that the English Established Church, the Church in communion with the Roman See, and various bodies of Christians in the East, are so many branches of the one Catholic Church, united in holding the defined faith, but each refusing to allow community of worship to the members of other branches, and disclaiming all subjection to a common government These profess readiness to submit to any pronouncement of the united Church but so long as the Church is disunited, the voice is dumb which they would regard as infallible The upholders of this doctrine are found among the followers of the Established Church of England, and its offshoots

The rest of the members of the English Establishment, together with such other Protestants as recognize the existence of any visible Church, take a different line They hold that there are certain articles of faith which they term fundamental, and they believe that belief in these fundamentals is sufficient to qualify for Church membership. All who hold these fundamentals may worship in common, and may submit themselves to such form of Church government as seems to them most convenient for securing order, and this may be so, even though they differ on such points of faith as are not fundamental This system, as well as the theory of branch Churches, will be found inconsistent with the passages of Scripture by which the Unity of the Church in faith, worship, and government

will be proved: and further it is to be observed that the distinction of fundamentals and non-fundamentals is absolutely destitute of Scripture authority, and that its supporters are not agreed as to the criteria, nor in the lists they put forward to show what they hold to be fundamental

In n 226 we shall prove that the theory of Branch Churches adopts in fact the distinction of Fundamentals and Non-Fundamentals

220. *Unity of Faith* —The great and all-sufficient proof that absolute unity of faith, extending to the whole body of revealed doctrine, is a property of the Church is found in what we proved in our last chapter concerning the infallibility which Christ has conferred upon the Church Christ has guaranteed that the Church shall not err in defining doctrine all Christians therefore must be prepared to accept all definitions which the Church has put forth or shall put forth, the alternative being to suppose that Christ is false to His word. Also, if we consider the end for which the Church was founded, we see the necessity for unity of faith, not merely for the fact of all agreeing to profess certain doctrines, but for them to admit the authority of some voice which can give an authoritative decision on all questions that can arise in the future The end of the Church is that men should act together in promoting the end for which each individual man was created the application to himself of the Redemption wrought by Christ But experience shows that differences in points of religious belief are great hindrances to the co-operation of men in any undertaking

disputes on these matters are apt to be rancorous in the extreme and even where all parties acknowledge that an Authority exists the sound of whose voice would command implicit submission, discussions on points which are still undefined are apt to be carried on with a warmth that is scarcely consistent with charity, and the Church from time to time imposes silence on both parties to a dispute in her theological schools This was done, for example, in 1607, by Pope Paul V. in regard to the controversy as to the efficacy of grace, and in 1667, by Alexander VII, in regard to a question concerning the nature of attrition One of the main reasons by which men justify their abandonment of all belief in Christ is derived from the fierce battles that rage among the Protestant sects these cannot all teach truth, it is said, for they call down curses on each other's errors; why should they not all be wrong?

The doctrine which we maintain is clearly implied in the fourth chapter of the Epistle of St. Paul to the Ephesians The Apostle is urging his disciples to support one another in charity and he urges them to remember that they have one body, one spirit, one hope of their calling, one Lord, one faith, one Baptism, one God Here the oneness of faith ascribed to a Christian community is put along with other things, the absolute oneness of which is indisputable The argument of the Apostle would indeed be weak if the one faith of which he speaks were confined to a limited number of doctrines, and were consistent with difference of

opinion about other parts of revealed doctrine The Ephesians are to be perfectly one in charity because they are in one faith· this would be a futile saying if there were a possibility that they should differ in faith while yet remaining members of the same community.

It will not be questioned that our doctrine is that of the Fathers, for in fact the idea that membership of the Church is consistent with differences of faith was unheard of until the great revolt of the sixteenth century But it may be useful to cite a few words from St. Irenæus, who writing about the year 166 ventures to say that the faith of the whole Church is one and the same throughout the world (*Adv Hæreses*, 1, 10, 3 , *P G* 7, 560)

Some objections to our doctrine are drawn from the parallel of the Jewish Church, which admitted Sadducees as members of the Council, although these Sadducees held undoubtedly false doctrines (Acts xxiii 6—8) In answer it is enough to say that the proofs which we have given for the case of the Christian Church keep their force, whatever may be the case with the Jewish Church, concerning whose constitution little is known Also, it is objected that some converts from Judaism continued to observe the Law of Moses after their conversion, although this law was no longer pleasing to God. This is true The Old Law ceased to be binding, or even a means of grace, from the day of Pentecost, when the New Law was promulgated and the Church was founded and from the date of the Council of Jerusalem (Acts xv), the opinion

that it was still obligatory, either on Jewish or on Pagan converts, was heretical, and this whether it were regarded as still retaining its old force or as having been incorporated into the law of Christ But time was needed before so great a change could come to the minds and consciences of men, especially as the wish of the Church that the Synagogue should be buried with honour led to the use of the old ceremonies being still allowed to be optional for Jewish converts, although these derived no spiritual profit from the obsolete observances (See n 278)

The above objections are founded on Scripture. Others of a more general nature are the following It is said that there can be no unity of faith in a community where the bulk of the members cannot know what they are called upon to believe, and this must be the case in every society of men The answer is that unity of faith does not require explicit belief what can be and is found in all the members of the Church is the explicit belief of certain dogmas, which this is not the place to specify, and the readiness of mind to believe whatever is proposed upon the authority of the Church, this being what is called implicit belief It is further alleged that it is tyrannical to claim to domineer over the minds of men that religion clean and undefiled is found in outward works of charity (St James i 27), and that to insist on unity of belief hampers the freedom of men in the search for truth We reply that this might be a just complaint, were it not that God has imposed upon men the duty of hearing the Church,

which speaks with an authority which is guaranteed against error by God Himself, as was proved fully in the last chapter and that man is helped and not hampered in the search for truth by being supplied with certain portions of truth of which he is absolutely assured.

221. *Unity of Worship* — That there must be unity of worship in the Church, in which worship all its members participate, will be thought hardly to need proof when we consider that in the Church men are associated together for the purpose of helping each other in the service of God and the following of Christ They will not help each other if they refuse to admit them to communion in worship and in fact the chief of the sacraments, the Holy Eucharist, is often called Holy Communion, because admission to common participation in it is esteemed in a peculiar manner a token of oneness in religion In the final charge given to the Apostles (St Matt xxviii 19) there is no hint of any Baptism but one; and we are prepared for the express declaration of St. Paul to the Ephesians (Ephes. iv 5) "One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism" The same Apostle, seeking to heal the discord which he found prevailing in the Church of Corinth, reminds the people that, as they partake of the same Sacraments, they ought to be united as members of one body (1 Cor xii 13, x 16), and the young Church at Jerusalem is praised, for that "they were persevering in the doctrine of the Apostles, and in the communication of the breaking of bread and in prayers."

The view taken in the earliest times of the guilt of one who, whether publicly or privately, joined in prayer with an excommunicated person, is proved by the tenth and eleventh of the so-called Canons of the Apostles, which assign excommunication as the penalty of the offence The form of these Canons is certainly not Apostolic but the substance of the two which we have quoted is believed by Hefele (*Councils*, vol i Appendix) to come down from Apostolic times and undeniably they have at all times been held to express the discipline of the Church, speaking just the same language as is spoken by the Bull *Apostolicæ Sedis* of October 12, 1869

222 *The Diptychs*.—This unity of worship was preserved in the early Church by two remarkable institutions, the Diptychs and Commendatory Letters We must find space to give such an account of these as will indicate their nature; the reader will not be able fully to appreciate the importance which was attached to them unless he make himself familiar with the original authorities on Church history

The word Diptych means folding tablets, such as were used by the ancients for many purposes They were of various sizes and were often highly ornamented, and the adornment of diptychs with their panels, has always been a favourite form of Christian art. But our concern is with the diptychs used in every church in ancient times containing a list of names of those persons with whom the priest when saying Mass publicly professed that he was in

spiritual communion, and who were in a special manner partakers in the fruit of the Sacrifice These included the Church Militant, the Church Triumphant, and the Church Suffering The names of the Pope and the Bishop were inserted, as they still are, in the Canon of the Mass in the Roman rite, also the names of distinguished persons, the reigning Emperor, living benefactors, and the like, also the names of some martyrs were recited, and of deceased Bishops who had been distinguished for holiness, and to these were added the names of other departed friends of the Church To insert the name of a person in the diptychs was a profession of religious union with him, and if a name was erased, this act amounted to a public renunciation of such union, and in this way the diptychs are often mentioned in the history of controversy. St Augustine threatens disorderly clerics that he will blot their names out from the tablets of the clergy (Serm 356, 14; *P.L* 39, 1,580); and when the fortunes of orthodoxy and of St. John Chrysostom stood and fell together, and the schismatical Patriarch of Constantinople had struck the name of his holy predecessor from the diptychs, the "Joannites" refused to attend Mass at the Cathedral and held assemblies of their own, and Atticus caused the name of John to be restored, in hopes of thus satisfying them (Socrates, *Hist. Eccl* 7, 25, *P G* 67, 793) The historian does not tell us whether the measure was successful This was in 408 In 480, the Patriarch Euthymius with his own hand restored the name of Pope Felix III to the diptych of

Constantinople, rising that of the heretic Mongus of Alexandria, with whom his predecessors had held communion (Theophanes, *Ad Ann.* 480; *P.G.* 108, 324.) The same method was adopted by way of professing that each church accepted the decrees of the great Councils in which the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity and the Incarnation was defined, thus, in 513, Euphrasius of Antioch struck out of his diptychs the Council of Chalcedon and the name of Pope Hormisdas, but afterwards through fear restored them, probably dreading a popular rising (Theophanes, *Ad Ann.* 513, *P.G.* 108, 392) and in 533 the Emperor Justinian writes to the Patriarch Epiphanius that he will lend the weight of his authority to discountenance all who removed from the Diptychs of the Church the mention of the three hundred and eighteen Fathers of Nice, or of the one hundred and fifty of Constantinople, and of the Synods of Ephesus and Constantinople this constitution being inserted in the Code became part of the common law of the Empire. (*Cod. Just.* 1, 1, 7, 21.) Such was the care taken to show that unity in faith and unity of worship were inseparable companions

223. *Letters*.—The Scriptures afford us traces of the early Christian use of Commendatory Letters, called also *Litteræ Formatæ*, because drawn up in a fixed form The practice was probably derived from the Jews, whose authorities would give letters to one of their body who was about to travel to secure him a kind reception by the synagogues (Acts ix. 1.) The opponents of St Paul at Corinth objected that

he had brought no letters (2 Cor iii. 1), and the practice is mentioned in other places (Acts xviii 27, Titus iii. 13.) The Galatian Church seems to have been deceived by forged letters (Galat ii 4), and there is a warning on the subject in what are called the Canons of the Apostles (chap xii), which though not truly of Apostolic origin, represent the very early discipline of the Church St Augustine, in one place, describes the seal with which e had closed his letter, " the face of a man looking to one ide," apparently as a precaution against tampering (Epist 59, 2 ; *P L.* 33, 227.)

We have curious heathen testimony to the practice and its efficacy. Lucian represents the philosopher Peregrinus as having wormed himself into the favour of the Christians, and as feeling assured that, let him go which way he would, he was secure of a maintenance, but he fell into crime and this resource failed him. (Lucian, *De Morte Peregrini*, p 998 of the edition of Paris, 1615 ' The death of Peregrinus happened about the year 166, and Lucian wrote not long after Again, the Emperor Julian the Apostate, whose heart was set on the overthrow of Christianity and the re-establishment of Paganism, cast about for means of securing permanence for his change, which he feared would otherwise not survive him , and he thought that he could not do better than imitate the polity of the Christians, with which he was acquainted, having had a clerical education and been advanced to the order of Reader Accordingly he gave orders for the temples of the gods being

arranged after the pattern of Christian churches, and for the practice of reading and preaching in them, he would appoint special days for prayer, and the practice of public penance for sin was to be encouraged. He would establish monasteries of men and women devoted to the study and practice of philosophy, as well as hospitals and other charitable institutions. "But especially," it is said, "he saw the value of the letters of the bishops, which secured to travellers, whencesoever they came and whithersoever they arrived, that they were received with all kindness, as most dear old friends, on the faith of the testimonial." So at least we read in Sozomen (5, 16, *P.G.* 67, 1,259), and whether or not we believe the story as to Julian's plans, it is at least plain that the historian knew that the efficacy of the letters was such as he mentions. To come to Christian testimonies, Tertullian (*De Præscript*, 20; *P.L.* 2, 32) tells us that all the many Churches were bound together by the exchange of "peace"—perhaps "the kiss of peace"—and by the name of "brother," and by the tokens securing hospitality. and our last quotation shall be from St. Augustine (Epist. 44, 3, *P.L.* 33, 175). Writing of the Donatist Bishop Fortunius, with whom he had been in controversy, he says: "First, he tried to make out that his communion existed in all parts of the world. I asked him whether he could give Commendatory Letters, such as we call *Literæ Formatæ*, to enable me to travel wherever I would, and I remarked, what was clear to every one, that this would afford an

easy way of settling the question" Of course, the letters of the schismatic would be of no avail outside the narrow limits of the Africans Here again we have plain proof that unity of worship and Church-membership were considered as going together

224 *Unity of Government* —The necessity of unity of government in the Church follows from nearly every text that has been quoted to prove the existence of the Church as a visible, organized society. It follows from the nature of a society that there must be some government (n 200) to direct the members to the end and if there is more than one supreme governor recognizing subjection to no one, there is more than one society. there is nothing to give unity to these governors This lesson is clearly taught, for the case before us, by the figures under which the Church is spoken of in Scripture Thus the Church is a Kingdom (St Matt xiii xvi., xx xxv) This figure is so common that it is enough to cite a few chapters from one of the Gospels, in which it is used perpetually, it is a city (St Matt v 15); a household (St Luke xv 11—24), a sheepfold (St. John x 11—16), a body (Romans xii, 1 Cor vi., 1 Cor xii) In all these figures we see a number of units made one by being under one government Men are considered to be subjects of one kingdom when they are subject to one king if two kings, or governments in any other form, bore sway within the same territory, each claiming absolute independence of the other, we should not say that the state was one, such a condition of things in fact could

have no permanent existence, for the question of predominance would soon be settled by war. If the territories were distinct we should have two kingdoms, even though the two were in close alliance In the same way, men conceive of a city, not as being a mere collection of houses, but as having oneness given to it by some oneness in the management. So, too, a household implies that there is one head of the family: otherwise we have two households, living together perhaps in harmony, but in no sense one The sheep within the same fold are conceived as being under the care of one shepherd, and all the members of one living body are directed by one animating principle

More directly we are taught the same lesson by the Apostle writing to the Ephesians (Ephes. iv 11—16), where we read that Christ instituting a government in the Church, distributed through several offices, "for the edifying of the Body of Christ, until we all meet into the unity of faith." If there were many governments, they would build up many bodies, and these could not all be the Body of Christ, nor would they lead their subjects to unity of faith, unless there were some supernatural control, such as is nowhere promised

There is no need to spend space in quoting testimonies of the Fathers on this subject abundant passages will be found in Waterworth's *Faith of Catholics* It will be enough to cite the emphatic words of St Irenæus "They that cause schism, be the trifling pretence what it may, hew and rend the great and glorious Body of Christ, and so far as

in them lies put Him to death . . . for the evil of schism is an evil greater than the good of any reform that they can work" (*Adv. Hær* 4, 33, n. 7, *P.G.* 7, 1,076) And St Cyprian, who wrote on the Unity of the Church, has the following (n. 17, *P.L.* 4, 513) "If one be separate from the Church, turn from him, shun him, he is perverse and in sin, and stands self-condemned" The authority of these Fathers has special weight with many of the moderns who oppose our doctrine

225 *Objections* —The question of the unity of worship and government in the Church is felt to be so important that no surprise can be felt at the multitude of objections that are raised against our doctrine and its proof. These have been collected by Dr Murray at the end of the first volume of his great work, *De Ecclesia*, where they should be studied by all who are interested in the matter. We can do no more than indicate some principles on which the replies are based.

I. Many of the objectors try to show that our argument from the figures is inconclusive, because they think it possible, in some peculiar circumstances, for the thing mentioned as a figure to exist without unity of government as if it be said that a body of men are going down the street, when in truth they are merely so many unconnected units. The reply is that the figure used is a popular illustration of the truth, and is not put forward as conveying more than what would ordinarily be understood Now it is undeniable that ordinarily the phrase "a body of men" suggests that several are

acting in concert for a common object and under the direction of a common superior, especially if it be pointed out that being many they are one body (1 Cor x 17), and an argument be drawn from the fact of this conspiration

II It is said again that the Church triumphant and the Church militant are one, and therefore, if our arguments hold, ought to have a common government We reply that there is a true sense in which the two are one, and yet in another sense they are distinct, and our arguments are drawn from the teaching of Scripture concerning the Church militant. none of the passages adduced make any reference to the Church triumphant.

III The exhortations which we read to care in preserving unity among Christians indicate that there is danger of this unity being lost But they show no more than that there is danger of this unity being lost by individuals, for by carelessness they may lapse into heresy and schism besides which, the mode in which Divine Providence secures the Church against ever losing her glorious prerogatives is not by using miracle or forcing the will of man, but by so effectually seconding the human means employed by the governors as to secure that the Church shall never suffer irreparable damage through the frailty of her members.

IV Figurative language can never lead to an assured conclusion. On the contrary, this use of figures is a most effectual mode of teaching, and were this otherwise, it would not have been so constantly employed by Christ and His Apostles

We do not mean to say that a demonstration can always be drawn from a single figure, but when many figures are used, the common character that runs through them all is easily detected

V. On one occasion there was a strife among the disciples of Christ "which of them should seem to be the greater, and He said to them, The kings of the Gentiles lord it over them, and they that have power over them are called beneficent but you not so; but he that is greater among you let him become as the younger" (St Luke xxii 24—26)

We see to what straits the opponents of our doctrine are reduced when we read that they interpret this text as condemning all exercise of superiority, as though it were unlawful in a Christian to hold any office of authority If this be the meaning, there is an end of civil government, for there is not a word to restrict the reference to Church matters, and we do not see how our Lord could have held Himself up as a model, as He does in the following verse, for He was undoubtedly Lord and Master. (St John xiii. 13) In truth, the warning is personal, and teaches those who are entrusted by God with any portion of authority over their fellow-men not to take honour and profit to themselves, as will be done by governors of all sorts who are guided by purely worldly principles This is the duty of rulers in Church and State alike. all are bound to exercise their office with a view to the welfare of their subjects, and to set an example of humility and self-forgetfulness.

VI Where there is unity of government, it is urged, there must be unity of laws, and since the Church does not insist on unity of laws, it follows that it does not really maintain unity of government The reply to this is, that as to the Divine laws touching the constitution of the Church, the Sacraments, and the like, there must be and is unity also there is unity in so far as all acknowledge the authority of one supreme legislator · but this legislator is guided in the exercise of his power by considerations of time and place, and if he neglected these his conduct in his office would be imprudent and in this way the unity of government is preserved, even though the discipline of one age and country differ from what is enforced in other centuries and regions There is unity of government in Great Britain, although the laws of Scotland differ from the laws of England

These specimens of objections must suffice There are none perhaps which can have much weight with any who fully appreciate the argument which we found in the figures used by our Lord and His Apostles to describe the Church It may be doubted whether any intelligible theory has ever been put forward which reconciles a visible Church and a divided government

226 *Rival Views* —In a previous place (n. 219) we described the system of Branch Churches and the system of Fundamentals The latter of these systems finds favour with those who glory in the name of Protestant, while the supporters of the former, for the most part, disclaim this name,

and would dissociate themselves, were it possible, from all who accept it as applicable to them · if they keep up spiritual communion with men whom they regard as heretics, it is with a protest and as a grudging concession to the times which they scarcely attempt to justify. But the fact is that both parties actually agree in holding the distinction of Fundamentals and Non-Fundamentals The advocates of the Branch Church theory do this in effect as often as they maintain the favourite position that Church-membership requires no more faith than is implied in holding the Creed of the Council of Nice, with the additions made by the Council of Constantinople, to which some would add the word *Filioque*, which was introduced by the authority of the Pope alone, without the aid of any Council the taste of others, in closer agreement perhaps with their principles, leads them to reject this word as making an undue call upon their obedience Some of them will urge the Decree by which the Council of Ephesus in 430 forbade the adding of new articles to the Creed as then existing, and by this contention show that they regard these articles as alone fundamental, while those added at the Council of Trent must be either false or at least indifferent, to be held or not without prejudice to the character of a member of the Church. These forget that the Council which put forth this Decree could not mean to bind the hands of future assemblies whose authority was no less than its own. For private men to put forth new Creeds or to curtail those already put forth by authority

would be a grievous usurpation, even were it not forbidden

227 *Recapitulation.* — In this chapter, after explaining what is meant by a property of the Church, and showing by certain examples what is the nature of schism, we have proved that the Church must be one in faith, in worship, and in government, and we have considered certain specimens of the objections brought against our doctrine, some remarks on the doctrines of Fundamentals and of Branch Churches close the chapter.

CHAPTER VI.

SANCTITY OF THE CHURCH.

228. *Subject of Chapter.*—The second property that we claim for the Church is Sanctity or Holiness. In the present chapter we shall explain what is meant by this word, and show that from many points of view the Church must be pronounced to be holy, with a holiness which is attested by singular favours bestowed by God.

229 *Meaning of Holiness.*—The idea of Holiness, or Sanctity, for the two words seem to have the same meaning, hardly admits of definition, for it is simple, and cannot be further analyzed The older writers describe it by negatives Thus, the author of the book on the Divine Names, that attained so much authority in the middle ages under the name of St. Denys the Areopagite, says (cap. 12, *P.G* 3, 969), "It is nothing but absolute and spotless cleanness, the absence of defilement" Another unknown writer identifies sanctity with Justice in relation to God (Hom. in S Lucam, cap. 1, *inter opera S. Joannis Chrysost*)

If we consider what things they are which are called holy, we find in the Scripture that God is pre-eminently holy and we learn from Isaias (vi 3)

and St John (Apoc. iv. 8) that to proclaim this holiness unceasingly is the special occupation of them that stand nearest to the throne in Heaven Also, those spots of ground which were in any special manner appropriated to God were holy (Exodus iii. 5, St. Matt. iv. 5), as were all articles employed in the worship of God (Exodus xxix. 29; Hebrews ix 2), but, passing over many other uses, we find that the word is peculiarly used of persons, whether on earth or in Heaven, who are, or are presumed to be, closely united to God by charity (Tobias ii 12, Romans i. 7; Apoc. v. 8, &c) The general idea of holiness would then seem to be nearness to God, the Source and Author of all Sanctity whether it be a thing, as an altar dedicated to Him, or an institution, like a holy day, designed to lead men to Him and as the word can be applied to men, it means the absence, more or less complete, of all that is positively displeasing to Him, and the presence of supernatural union with Him by charity.

230. *The Church Holy.*—That the Church is in some sense holy will scarcely be disputed. The Founder of the Church is God Himself, the Fountain of all Holiness, which He communicates in such manner as He sees fit to the works of His hands When Christ speaks (St Matt xvi 18) of building His Church upon the rock, He seems to call our attention to this building as being in some special sense His handiwork and we can imagine that when speaking He contemplated that Church as He would have made it, "not having spot nor

wrinkle nor any such thing," "holy and without blemish" (Ephes v. 27), an ideal which, through the malice of man, will never be realized to the full upon this earth.

Further, the Church is holy, inasmuch as it is set on earth to be the means of leading men to union with God. The purpose and end of the Church is to continue the work which Christ began on earth, and this work is holy, for it is to enable and help men to the attainment of that supernatural possession and enjoyment of God in Heaven for which they are destined This destiny will be theirs in virtue of their membership of the Church, and the ability to gain it comes to them as they receive that interior grace which is the portion of all men, for all are in some sense members of the soul of the Church, however imperfect that membership may be (n. 187, and Hurter, *Compendium*, n 225) St. Justin Martyr does not hesitate to claim the heathen sages as being his fellow-Christians (*Apol* i 46; *P.G* 6, 397) Further, the members of the Church receive aids to advance in holiness when they partake of those Sacraments to which they have access in virtue of their membership. in which Sacraments they receive or are restored to habitual grace, if their souls are lacking the garment of charity; or, if they already have this precious gift, then these Sacraments furnish helps to retain and adorn it The Church also, by her infallible voice, teaches her members the truth about God, instructs them how they can unite themselves with Him by prayer, and guides each in the practice of all

virtue, she warns against evil communications, and encourages all to seek for help to grow in holiness by studying the example of such of her children as have profited by her teaching.

These general considerations are common perhaps to all denominations of Christians, though there may be some variety in the language in which they would be expressed. The explanation of the terms which we have used, and the defence of them when needful, must be sought in other Treatises those on Grace, Justification, and the Sacraments. They go far to explain the sense in which the Holy Scripture so constantly ascribes Sanctity to the Church, and to her members, in virtue of what ought to be the holiness of the members of a holy body In the Acts and Epistles, the word "Saint" is perpetually used as equivalent to "Christian." Saul, the persecutor, did much evil to the "Saints in Jerusalem," that is, to the members of the Church in that city· and most of the Epistles are addressed to the "Saints" who are in such or such a place (*e g*, Ephes. 1. 1), and in the older books, the same word is used of all who were serving God as members of the Jewish Church (Psalm xxix. 5), and this even when God sees reason to reprove them for their personal conduct (Isaias xlii. 28, on which see Father Knabenbauer's *Commentary*)

231 *Heroic Sanctity.*—But this Sanctity of the Church in the Author that founded her, in the purpose of her existence, and in the means by which she strives to promote that purpose, is not all besides all this, and in spite of the perversity

of man, she is successful in securing holiness in a large number of her children, some of whom co-operate with grace so effectually as to rise to that altogether extraordinary degree of sanctity which is called heroic virtue Much depends upon obtaining a correct notion of the meaning of this phrase, as used by theologians, and we shall endeavour to explain it, following the safe guidance of Pope Benedict XIV, who, before being raised to the Papacy in 1740, had been employed for many years as "Devil's Advocate," charged with the duty of seeing that no Servant of God was admitted to the honour of being declared "Blessed" or "Saint" without due proof of all that the law requires in such cases and among the rest, he had to weigh the sufficiency of proofs offered to show the presence of heroic sanctity in such candidates as did not die the death of martyrs The experience gathered in this office is embodied by the author in his great work on Beatification and Canonization The account of heroic virtue in general is found in the 21st and 22nd chapters of the Third Book in the following chapters the doctrine is applied to the theological and cardinal virtues

There is no need to descant in this place upon virtue in general, for the common understanding of the word is sufficiently correct for our purpose, but we may give the definition of it employed by St Augustine (*De libero arbitr* 2, 19, 50, *P L* 32, 1268), and after him by St Thomas (*Sum Theol* 1 2 q 55 art 4) it is "a good quality of the mind, directing life rightly, of which none make a

bad use, which God works in us without ourselves " nor need we go into details about the theological virtues of Faith, Hope, and Charity, which relate directly to God, and the need of which is known by Revelation alone, nor about the cardinal virtues of Prudence, Justice, Temperance, and Fortitude, which are convenient heads under which to arrange all other virtues our concern is to see what is the special character which these virtues must have before we can say they are present in an heroic degree

This word "heroic" is borrowed by Christian theologians from the heathen poets and philosophers of antiquity, who gave the name of "hero" to those men whose great achievements were held to prove that they were the children of the gods, or were raised to an equality with them (See Horace, *Odes*, 3, 3) The abstract possibility of high virtue among men who have not faith will not be questioned by any but those who hold the condemned doctrines that all the works of infidels are sins (Bains, 25, Denz 905), and that an infidel necessarily sins in all he does (Alexander VIII , Denz 1165), the justice of which condemnations is shown in the Treatise on Grace It may be doubted, however, whether such virtue ever was in fact attained it is true that we read of acts of what looks like a high degree of temperance and the like, but it seems probable that the very persons to whom these acts are ascribed were at the same time the slaves of habits of vice with which it is impossible for true virtue to co-exist

All true virtue must be founded on humility, and humility is a character as far removed as possible from the idea of one whom the heathen called a hero. On this account, St Augustine hesitates and apologizes, as for a bold novelty, when he ventures to speak of the Martyrs as the Heroes of the Christians (*De Civit. Dei* 10, 21; *P.L.* 41, 299) But when Christian ideas had replaced the ideas of Paganism in the minds of men, the term "hero" was felt to be suitable as a description of Martyrs, from whom it was transferred to Confessors and other Saints

The explanation of what constitutes an heroic grade of virtue is given in various forms of phrase by various theologians, but in substance all agree that virtue is to be called heroic when it rises conspicuously above the measure that is common among men who lead good lives This account, it is true, does not touch the essence of the matter, but it gives a description which is sufficient for our purpose We say then that within the body of the Church of Christ there will always be not only many who belong to the Soul, in the sense explained before (n 187), who are friends of God and live lives of ordinary virtue, but also that there will always be some whose virtue is of a higher stamp, and will show itself from time to time by acts which surpass the ordinary standard · just as in an army we may expect that there are many who never for a moment think of neglecting their duty and failing to face the enemy, while there are some who only wait for an occasion to offer itself, when their military

virtue will make itself manifest by conspicuous acts of valour.

232 *The Church holy in her members*.—In n 230 we have proved that the Church of Christ must be holy, and this proof might dispense us from saying anything about the holiness of her members, for every society is made up of its members But it may be worth while to call attention to some texts of Scripture, merely as specimens of what might be produced, which seem to point more directly to the holiness of the members of the Church · a holiness which will assuredly from time to time show itself in the notable and illustrious deeds of those men in whom the work of Christ is done with the greatest perfection Thus, the 71st Psalm undoubtedly refers to Christ, whether directly or through Solomon, as a type of Him (as has been held by almost all interpreters, following the ancient Chaldee Targum), and in the seventh verse we read "In His days shall justice spring up, and abundance of peace, till the moon be taken away" And Isaias foresees the time of the coming of Christ (lxii 11, 12), when "it shall be heard in the ends of the earth that the Saviour cometh, and they shall call them, The holy people, the redeemed of the Lord" See, too, Psalm ii 6, Isaias xi 6, liv. 7 Let this language be contrasted with the words of pleading which are addressed by God to sinners in so many passages of Scripture, as in Ezechiel (xviii 30) "Be converted and do penance for all your iniquities, and iniquity shall not be your ruin" the broad line of separation betwe[illegible] the members of the Church and

those who have not as yet the happiness to belong to her will be felt at once

The same conclusion follows from the promise of Christ (St. Matt. xxviii. 20) to be with His Church all days, in teaching men to observe all things whatsoever He had commanded: and His longing for the fulfilment of His work (St. Luke xii. 50), and that the work of His Church might produce abiding fruit, could not be altogether frustrated. The Parables of the Field (St. Matt xiii), the Net (*ibid*), the House (1 Timothy ii 20), show that in the Church are found good fruit, good fish, and vessels of gold and silver.

For the passages of the Fathers that teach that there must at all times be many holy men in the Church, we must refer as usual to Waterworth's *Faith of Catholics*. It must suffice to quote St. Irenæus, in whose work against heresy the whole of the Catholic doctrine of the Church is to be found: "Where is the Church, there is the Spirit of God; and where is the Spirit of God, there is the Church and all grace the Spirit is Truth." (St. Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* 3, 24, 1; *P.G.* 7, 966)

233. *Worldly Success.*—It is perhaps not useless to remark that the success which is promised to the Church is success in her work of applying to the souls of men the redemption wrought by Christ and of working in them such likenesses of God as by His grace may be possible. It is true that kings shall be the nursing fathers of the Church, and queens her nurses (Isaias xlix 23), but she does

not expect worldly greatness, or to do deeds that win the applause of men She knows that better is a child that is poor and wise than a king that is old and foolish (Eccles iv 13) that it is well rather to be an abject in the house of God than to dwell in the tabernacles of sinners (Psalm lxxxiii 11)· and although the faithful observation of her precepts would advance the true good of man in all respects, and contempt of these precepts leads to the ruin of civil society, yet she does not seek her saints among those persons who make themselves famous by increasing the wealth of themselves or of their country, or by winning military glory or the like: she finds that these saints and heroes of the world are often the slaves of disgraceful appetites; and that even if free from the grosser vices they are apt to be far from having, or even aspiring to any likeness to Him Who was meek and humble of heart (St Matt xi 29.)

234 *Objections*—Very few objections are brought by Christians against the doctrine that the Church of Christ must be holy in her members, for no one who accepts the Scriptures as the Word of God, and the teaching of Christ as a Divine message, will allege that His work has been an entire failure That some members of the body of the Church are not holy is unhappily true, but this does not disprove our doctrine that many are holy, and our proofs go no further than showing what is the tendency of the doctrine and discipline of the Church, which tendency will certainly not be altogether frustrated. nor are we troubled by fear lest

it should some day be shown that the greater number of her members are in sin, for this cannot be known without a revelation such as there is no reason to expect, and even if the revelation were given, we remember that an institution is to be judged by the effect of its action upon those men who are imbued with its spirit, not upon those who pertinaciously resist its influence.

235. *Miracles*.—The favour of God to His Church is shown not only by the grace imparted to her members, by which they all may become holy, but also by His imparting to some among them a share in His own power over nature which is called the gift of miracles. When speaking in our first Treatise of the Credentials of the Christian Revelation (chapters ii. iii. iv.) we recapitulated the proofs of the possibility of physical miracles furnished by Catholic philosophy, and we proved historically that the Divine Mission of Christ was attested by such miracles. There is no need to repeat this matter, in the present connection, for we now accept the authority of the Scriptures as definitive (see n. 162); and no one can doubt that the Scriptures tell of cases where physical miracles were worked by Christ and by mere men. Our business now is to show that Christ has promised that the gift of miracles should continue in His Church.

Some of the gratuitous gifts of God to the souls of men are given primarily for the benefit of the recipient, and these will be discussed in full in our Treatise on Grace. Others are given primarily for

the benefit of others, and to enable the recipient to fulfil some office in the Church, and some of these are enumerated by St Paul. (1 Cor xii) They have received from theologians the name of "graces gratuitously given," a tautology justified by usage, and they include the gift of prophecy, the gift of tongues, and among the rest, the grace of healing and the working of miracles, of which St Thomas treats in the *Summa* (2 2 q 188) The Saint teaches that the Holy Spirit, providing all things necessary for the Church, grants the word of wisdom, that the doctrine of Christ may be preached and that the same Spirit grants the grace of healing, in attestation of the truth of the preacher's word, as it is said that the Lord confirmed the word of the Apostles with signs that followed (St Mark xvi 20.) This mode of proof, which was used in the beginning, is peculiarly adapted to the nature of man, more especially when the miracle takes the form of the cure of hopeless diseases The circumstances of each miracle must be carefully considered, not merely that we may distinguish it from merely natural wonders and from the illusions of Satan, but also to determine what is the truth which it attests Sometimes it attests the sanctity of a man who is still living, and at whose word it is wrought, and of course sinners cannot work miracles of this sort so also, if it be wrought on the invocation of the aid of one who has passed out of this world· but if the miracle attest a true doctrine there is nothing to hinder its being wrought at the word of one who is in sin, for

the words, "God doth not hear sinners" (St John IX. 31) were spoken by one who had been healed of bodily blindness, but who was still spiritually blind, and did not understand the fulness of the mercy of God in hearing the prayer of all men, as St Augustine observes (*Tr. in Joan* 44, n. 13, *P.L.* 35, 1718.)

Such is the general account given by St. Thomas of the reasons why this gift of miracles is granted to some in the Church. In accordance with his usual plan, he does not give reasons for believing that the grant is actually made, for he made it his business to explain and co-ordinate the Catholic doctrine, but not to prove it, in the manner that has been usual since the time when heresy first took the form of denying the authority of the Church (*Sum.* I I. 8.) We, however, must give the proof, and it is not difficult, for the promises made by Christ are most explicit. Thus He said (St John XIV. 12), "He that believeth in Me, the works that I do, he also shall do, and greater than these shall he do," and the meaning of the word "work" is proved by comparison with many places in the same Gospel (v. 36, VII. 3, &c.) Again (St Mark XVI. 17), "These signs shall follow them that believe. In My Name they shall cast out devils: they shall speak with new tongues: they shall take up serpents: and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them they shall lay their hands upon the sick and they shall recover" In the Acts of the Apostles we read of many occasions when the preaching was confirmed by miracle, as notably

when the lame man was healed at the Beautiful Gate of the Temple (Acts iii.), the force of which attestation was felt by the Jewish Sanhedrim. (Acts iv. 16) Such, then, was at one time, the mode in which God dealt with His Church, and if any one assert that a change has been introduced, the burden is on him to show when and where this took place, or at least to give some reason to believe that there has been a change This he will be wholly unable to do We believe that the gift of physical miracles is still granted from time to time, when God sees that it is needed in attestation of the truth, as a supplement to the moral miracles which are of incessant occurrence.

No objections, as it seems, can be raised to the doctrine of this paragraph, except by such as deny the possibility of miracles, and the authority of the Scriptures: and with these, as just remarked, we have not now to deal, and by such as rest on the assertion that no miracles do occur at the present day, and who are therefore forced to find some meaning for the promises of Christ (St John xiv. 12, St. Mark xvi. 17) and for the doctrine of St. Paul (1 Cor. xii. 10), different from that which appears on the face of the words. We, on the contrary, assert that there is no reason to depart from the literal meaning of the promises, and that the gift of miracles has not been withdrawn from the Church. but this discussion will be conveniently reserved for our ninth chapter, in which we shall show that communion of Christians it is that

possesses the properties which we prove to belong to the Church founded by Christ (n. 245)

236 *Recapitulation*.—In this chapter we have shown that the Church is holy in her Author, her end, her doctrine, and her members. many members of the Body of the Church living in the habitual friendship of God, while the sanctity of some reaches the heroic degree, showing itself in acts of virtue beyond the spiritual strength of ordinary men; and that Christ has promised that the gift of miracles shall not be wanting to His Church.

CHAPTER VII.

CATHOLICITY OF THE CHURCH.

237. *Subject of the Chapter.*—In this chapter we shall explain the true meaning of the word Catholic, and shall show that to be Catholic, in the theological sense, is an essential, indefeasible, property of the Church of Christ. The argument of the chapter is taken from Scripture and history.

238. *The Meaning of "Catholic."*—"Catholic" is a word of Greek origin, signifying "throughout the whole," and is used in this sense in various connections by heathen writers both Greek and Latin, as may be seen in the dictionaries. The word is found in the same general sense in the earliest Christian writers: thus, St Justin Martyr speaks of the Catholic, or general, resurrection (*Dial. c. Tryph* 81 ; *P G.* 6, 669), and Tertullian of the Catholic, or all-embracing, goodness of God (*Adv. Marcion*, 2, 17; *P L.* 2, 304) The first occasions where we find the word used in the sense that is now familiar, seem to be the declaration in the Epistle of St Ignatius to the Church of Smyrna that wherever Christ is, there is the Catholic Church (*P G.* 5, 713), and the letter in which the same Church of Smyrna describes the martyrdom of the holy Bishop

Polycarp, which is addressed to "all the parishes of the Holy Catholic Church in every place," that is to say, to the local Churches, the communities in each town which adhered to the Universal Church. (In Euseb. *Hist Eccles* 4, 15; *P G.* 20, 340) These testimonies belong to the second century. By the time that the Donatist controversy arose, the use of the word had become so well established, perhaps because it is employed in the Nicene Creed, that the schismatics could not venture to discard it, and yet in its accepted sense it was plainly not applicable to a sect confined to a narrow portion of Africa they were, therefore, compelled to invent a new meaning for the old word, and explain that all were Catholics who observed all the commandments and used all the Sacraments. St. Augustine, on the other hand, protested that nothing was Catholic but what is diffused throughout the world, of which none can be ignorant, for it cannot be hid. (Epist. liii. 1; *P L.* 33, 194, and elsewhere continually.)

It may be useful to remark that the word Catholic did not come into the form of the Apostles Creed employed at Rome and in the West until somewhat late (Denz. 1—13)

239 *The Church of Christ Catholic* —It will not be questioned that the Church of Christ teaches all His doctrine, inculcates all His precepts, and uses all His Sacraments but we maintain that besides all this, the Church is by her destiny and constitution suited for all regions of the earth and all races of men, that she is always conspicuous among Christian communities for her diffusion and

numbers, and that she will before the close of history become known in all parts of the world The proof of this doctrine is found in the prophecies and promises which we read in the Scripture, and which are so plain that it will be enough to transcribe a very few

I. In Abraham, "shall all the kindred of the earth be blessed" (Genesis xii. 3), on which text we have the inspired commentary of St. Paul. (Galat. iii. 8)

II The Gentiles shall be given as an inheritance to Christ (Psalm ii. 8 and Hebrews i. 5)

III. Christ shall reign from sea to sea: all the kings of the earth shall adore Him (Psalm lxxi. 8, 11, and see n. 232)

IV. All nations shall flow to the Church, and many people shall go up to the mountain of the Lord. (Isaias ii. 2)

V The strength of the Gentiles shall come to the Church (Isaias lx 5)

VI From the rising of the sun even to the going down, the name of God is great among the Gentiles, and in every place there is Sacrifice (Malach. i 11)

VII. Going, therefore, teach all nations . . . and behold, I am with you. (St Matt xxviii. 19, 20, and see n. 206, ii)

We are compelled to be content with quoting the few most salient words of these texts. The force of the proof will be better appreciated if the whole of each passage is read, and compared with the parallels referred to in the margins of our Bibles In this way it will become plain that the Church of

the New Testament was destined to be of world-wide extent, not confined to the Jews or to any other nation or nations, but embracing all the Gentiles and all lands, to be, in fact, of its very nature, Catholic; and this diffusion will be such as to force itself on the attention of men, for the things described cannot be done in a corner

240 *Early Testimonies* —The nature of the diffusion promised will be better understood if we consider some testimonies that show the great effect already produced by the preaching of the Gospel before the end of the second century after the Birth of Christ We will cite two places from early writers

I. "In every nation, Greek or barbarian, of them that dwell in waggons, or houseless nomads, or tent-dwellers, prayers and thanksgivings are offered to the Father and Creator of all in the Name of Jesus the Crucified." (St Justin Martyr, *Dial. c Tryph* 117, *P.G.* 6, 747.) Josephus tells us that the Jewish race was found everywhere (*Bell Jud.* 2.), but St. Justin urges against his Jewish adversary the far wider diffusion of the Christian faith.

II Tertullian remarks that ignorance of Christianity was the chief hindrance to conversions, as soon as men came to know they ceased to hate, and conversion followed. The result was that the enemies of the faith found with sorrow that the towns, the open country, the villages, the islands, were full of Christians. (*Apol* 1, *P.L.* 1, 262.)

We have already cited other passages to the same effect in another connection (nn 41, 67) For the Fathers, see Waterworth's *Faith of Catholics*

241 *Force of the Proof*—The description given in these texts of the Church of Christ would not be verified, if at any time it were surpassed in numbers and diffusion by any other communion claiming to be Christian. But the texts do not necessarily imply that the Church will always surpass all other Christian communions taken together, although we believe that she has done and always will do so. It seems most natural to understand the texts as pointing to some yet future time when the Church will be conspicuous in every nation of the earth; but it is to be borne in mind that some theologians think that no more is promised than that each nation in its turn will be subdued to the Gospel, while we cannot feel sure that nations which have had the faith and have lost it, as is the case in northern Africa, will be again offered the priceless treasure which they have despised.

Some objections to our doctrine that might be considered in this place are more conveniently reserved for the ninth chapter (nn. 256, 258.) Others have been answered by anticipation, in the chapter on the Visibility of the Church (n. 170.)

242 *Recapitulation*.—In this chapter, after explaining the theological meaning of the word Catholic, we showed from Scripture that the Church of Christ was essentially Catholic, and that she became conspicuous in diffusion and numbers before the close of the second Christian century.

CHAPTER VIII.

APOSTOLICITY OF THE CHURCH.

243. *Subject of Chapter.*—In this chapter, we shall explain the sense in which the Church is declared in the Nicene Creed to be Apostolic.

244. *Meaning of "Apostle."*—The original meaning of the word "Apostle" is "one sent," an envoy, messenger; and in this sense the word is freely used by Greek writers. But the word received its special, ecclesiastical meaning when our Lord chose it to denote the office which, early in His Public Life, He conferred upon a chosen number of His immediate followers. The account of their appointment, with the list of their names and the charge they received, is found in all the synoptic Gospels. (St. Matt. x., St. Mark iii.; St. Luke vi.) The selection was made after a whole night spent in the prayer of God: the first, as we learn from St. Matthew (x. 2.), Simon who is called Peter, with eleven others. these He named Apostles (St. Luke vi. 13); they were to be with Him, and that He might send them to preach, and He gave them power to heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse the lepers, cast out devils: a power which was exercised by them (St. Mark vi. 13), as also by the larger body of disciples who sub

work, and confirmed the word with signs that followed (St. Mark xvi. 20); and that their success was so speedy and glorious as to admit of being described in the terms that we have quoted from writers of the following century. (nn. 41, 67, 240.)

All accounts agree in representing that St. John alone of the Apostles died a natural death, the others ending their lives by martyrdom. There is a story told concerning them which is intrinsically probable and may well be true, although the direct testimony for it is weak Perhaps the earliest authority for it is Rufinus, who died in 410; he wrote a Commentary on the Apostles' Creed, and he says (n. 2; *P.L* 21, 337) that the Apostles came to a common agreement as to the standard of the preaching which they were about to begin, lest after their separation they should give different accounts of the faith to which they called men. So coming together, and filled with the Holy Ghost, they contributed each an article to what became the common creed proposed to all who sought Baptism. Later writers improve on the story, and tell us exactly what point is due to each of the Twelve, and their accounts have found their way into Christian art, they are, however, of no historical value. It need hardly be observed that the precaution was directed against the risk of one teaching something to his neophytes which others omitted as needless such accounts would differ, but not be contradictory St Thomas (*Summa*, 2. 2 q 1. a. 6) explains how it is that the one faith can be broken up into articles of a creed

Those Christian communities, or local Churches, which could boast that they received the faith from an Apostle, were proud of the circumstance, for it gave peculiar assurance of the purity of their doctrine such Churches are often referred to, under the name of Apostolic Churches (St Augustine, Epist 44, *Ad Eleusium*, 3, *P L* 33, 175)

Many saints of recent times who have done much by their preaching to spread the Gospel among the heathen have sometimes been called Apostles thus St Augustine is the Apostle of England, St. Francis Xavier of Japan, and so on. No particular significance attaches to the title.

246 *The Church Apostolic.*—The promise of Christ to be with His Apostles in their preaching until the end of the world was not fulfilled in their persons, but its fulfilment is found in the Divine assistance given to the Church, and, as we shall show in the next Treatise, especially to the Pope, the successor of St. Peter as Bishop of Rome, in whom the fulness of the Apostolic dignity still exists on earth

At present it is enough to observe that we have shown in a previous chapter, that the Church has authority to teach, that she is infallible in her teaching, and that there is in her, by Divine institution, an organized hierarchy with authority to govern. (nn 200—211) The seat of these authorities is found in the body of Bishops, who, as will be proved hereafter (n 295), cannot fail to be in union with the Roman Pontiff, and the authority which has come to the Bishops and is exercised by them,

is none other than that which was bestowed upon and exercised by the Apostles. No other source is possible, unless a new revelation be given: and this we know will not be (n 113.)

So far there is general agreement among Christians: the Church of Christ must in some way have succeeded to the Apostles. A Bishop of the present day has his authority because he is a successor of the Apostles, whether the Church he governs be an Apostolic Church (n 245), or have been founded by one who came with Apostolic authority derived from some other Church We are not now speaking of that episcopal consecration which is necessary before any one is capable of doing all that belongs to the office of a Bishop we shall deal with this when speaking of the Sacrament of Order; but the authority to teach and to govern may belong to one who has not received consecration, while it cannot belong to one to whom it has not come by way of succession from the Apostles.

Thus we are brought to the important question, What constitutes true succession? by what test are we to judge whether a particular claimant is or is not the lawful successor of one concerning whose authority there is no doubt? If this question be asked in the abstract, it is not easy to give an answer, although there is seldom much difficulty in replying as regards any particular case We may, however, say in general that the rule of the succession must be the old and acknowledged rule, the claimant who asserts that the rule which has been

observed heretofore is unauthorized and bad, may be right in his assertion, but he cannot be said to come in as successor, he may possibly have a higher and better title, but the succession is broken; the old line is extinct, a new line has come in, which must show its credentials Another test is to observe how far the claimant is recognized by others who hold similar positions by an undisputed right The justice of these negative tests will be seen if we think of the case of a person who claims to be mayor of a town he may say, for example, that he has been elected by the voice of the people at large, whereas his predecessors had for a long series of years been nominated by the lord of the borough: we may perhaps agree with him that his title is better than that of those that went before him, but it is different he is the first of a new line on whom rests the burden of proving that theirs is a lawful title prescription is against them, and especially is this so, if it be found that none of the surrounding mayors regard him as sitting in the chair of their old associate

247. *Recapitulation.*—In this chapter, the nature of the Apostolic office is explained, and the Church is shown to be necessarily Apostolic in doctrine and in government.

CHAPTER IX.

NOTES OF THE CHURCH.

248. *Subject of the Chapter.*—In this chapter, after explaining how the properties which we have proved to belong to the Church furnish us also with marks by which she may be recognized, we shall show that no Christian community shows these marks except that which is in communion with the Bishop of Rome, while the community which recognizes the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff possesses them all to the full

249 *Notes of the Church.*—We have shown that Christ was a Messenger from God, and in due time we shall show that He was in truth much more He was Himself true God at the same time that He was true Man, but it is enough for our present purpose to say that He spoke with the authority of God. From the record of His teaching which we find in the Gospels—considered merely as trustworthy human histories, and not as inspired (n 205) —and in other monuments, we have shown that He founded a visible Church (n 168) or organized society, the membership of which was something not purely interior but also exterior, that this Church is perennial, destined to last to the end of

time (n 166), and He imposed on all men the duty of becoming members of this Church (n 181), a duty the fulfilment of which is sometimes impossible, through ignorance or other causes, but the neglect of which is in all cases a grievous misfortune, on account of the loss of the great spiritual blessings which are reserved for those who are visibly in the communion of the Church We have further shown, in the four chapters preceding the present, that the Church of Christ is deservedly called, One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic, she is One in doctrine, worship, and government, she is Holy in her doctrine and discipline, and in the holiness of many of her members, which sometimes is seen to attain an heroic degree of virtue and to be attested by miracles, she is Catholic in being suited and spread to all the regions and nations of the earth, and in conspicuously outnumbering any other communion of followers of Christ, and lastly, she is Apostolic, being governed by a divinely constituted hierarchy, the members of which from generation to generation receive their authority from their predecessors

It follows that among the Christian communities that we see around us, there is one and one only which is the true Church founded by Christ, which it is the duty of all men to enter, and to obey, that this one community has the properties that have been enumerated, and that no other Christian community has these properties In view of the duty and advantage of membership, it is necessary to discover which this one community is

It is here that the properties which we have

enumerated prove to be important. They are not merely internal invisible characters, such as the perennity, of which we are assured by the Divine promise alone, for no man can foresee the future with certainty; nor are they characters which can be shared by other societies, as visibility can, but they are Divine gifts to the Church and to the Church alone, of such nature that they display themselves visibly and unmistakeably, serving as guides to make known to the inquirer where he is to recognize the Church which has the Divine claim to his submission It is in this sense that the four properties enumerated are said to furnish notes or badges distinguishing the true Church; and it is in this way that they have been used by the theologians ever since the first rise of this fundamental controversy. Cardinal Bellarmine in his Controversies (tom. 2, lib 4) used fifteen Notes, but these can be conveniently reduced to the four which are mentioned in the Nicene Creed.

250. *Christian Communities Classified* —We know that a large number of communities exist in the world, all professing to be the followers of Christ We have to study these in order to discover which among them bears the badges, by which, as we have seen, the true Church of Christ is to be known, and before we can do this, some classification is necessary, for otherwise we shall be involved in much needless repetition First then, there is the community which glories in submission to the Roman Pontiff as Vicar of Christ, who has received from God immediate, ordinary jurisdiction over the

whole flock (n 286), then, several communities may conveniently be spoken of collectively as the Eastern Church, whose adherents are found chiefly among the Russians and Greeks, next we may reckon the Established Church of England, with the offshoots that exist in all countries where English is spoken we shall speak of these as Prelatic communions, and lastly, there are multitudinous sects existing in Great Britain and the colonies, in northern Europe, the United States of America and elsewhere, all of whom may for our purposes be regarded as one we will use the word Unprelatic to designate all of these, for this word marks a feature that is common to them all, that they refuse to recognize the authority of any order of men corresponding to Catholic Bishops, and it is this refusal which, historically, has been the chief cause of their severance from the Prelatic. In England they are called Dissenters or Nonconformists, as being Protestants who dissent from the Established Church and refuse to conform to it We will consider these in order, and it will be convenient to begin with the last-named

251 *The Unprelatic* —Few words are needed to show that no sect among the Unprelatic has the Notes of the Church of Christ They certainly have not unity of faith, for even among those that exist in England there are some score of substantial differences of doctrine, besides minuter shades innumerable, and the diversity in other countries where these people are found is at least as great as here. Nor is this wonderful, for they agree in not

acknowledging any external objective principle of unity, and boast that they have liberty of private judgment, without being subject to any control in matters of faith. They have unity of worship, in the sense that they do not hesitate to attend the services in chapels belonging to other sects than their own, but most among them refuse to admit any one to the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, without inquiry into his belief and life With few exceptions they disclaim all unity of government as of Divine institution. As to sanctity, the doctrines as to grace and justification held by most of these sects seem little calculated to lead men to lives of holiness; but, nevertheless, probably many of them lead good lives according to their very imperfect lights; but we do not hear of any who rise above the common race of men by what is called heroic sanctity, and there are few of them who assert that miracles occur in their body.

Certainly the sects in question are not Catholic, in the sense in which we have proved that the Church of Christ is Catholic. Some of them claim this honoured name to themselves to signify that they are all-embracing, there being no form of religious belief that they condemn, by as good a right, heathen Rome might have been called Catholic, for as St Leo remarks, this city deemed itself very religious, for there was no error that it was not ready to embrace (Serm 82, 2, *P.L.* 54, 423.) But it is merely silly to employ old well-known words in totally new senses, the true, historical meaning of the word is that in which it was employed by

St Augustine (n 228), and after him by all writers down to recent times In this sense, no one of the Unprelatic sects can be considered Catholic for none show any tendency to spread beyond the country and language in which they had their origin, nor is any one of them conspicuous for its numbers In this matter we must not be deceived by words, if we find "Methodists" or "Baptists" in considerable numbers in the British Empire and America, we must remember that these names include many distinct sects differing in faith, and often without the common bond of mutual sympathy.

Some of the sects give the name of Bishop to certain of their officials, as is done by the Lutherans in Sweden and by the Methodists in America; but none of them profess to trace the existence of their organization further back than the sixteenth century, so that they have no claim to be called Apostolic Each sect started fresh when its founders educed a new system of doctrine and discipline from the Scriptures

252 *The Prelatic* —There exists in England a religious body recognized by the law of the country, and enjoying certain legal privileges, and the applicability of the notes of the Church of Christ to this body requires distinct consideration This body is distinguished from the Dissenters in being governed by Bishops, many of whom are, materially speaking, the successors of Bishops whose position was recognized throughout the Christian world before the Reformation Communions sprung from this

central body exist in all the countries where English is spoken; these are more or less in sympathy one with another, and they agree in using the same formularies, with more or less of modification They are Prelatic, and have therefore a semblance of possessing the notes of the Church of Christ, which cannot be said of their Unprelatic rivals

But on closer inspection, this semblance disappears, for what at first looks like one community, turns out on inspection to be a mere bundle of discordant sects, bound together by a merely external bond It will be enough to speak of the mother body found in England, for no one will maintain that the notes of the Church of Christ are found in the offshoots if they be lacking in the common stem, the English Establishment We proceed then to consider how far the notes appear in this communion.

First, there is no unity of faith, of worship, or of government. All the office-bearers agree in having, in words, accepted certain formularies, as the condition of admission to their posts, but they hold themselves at perfect liberty to explain these formularies as they please; and the language in which they are couched lends itself to the greatest variety of explanation. There is no living authority within the body that even pretends to be able to decide what is the true doctrine on disputed points, and there is no machinery for controlling heretical teaching, except that the State withdraws its recognition from such ministers of the Establishment as are convicted in the civil court of having taught

doctrine which contradicts the formularies which are part of the law of the land The principle of unity of faith being lacking, it is no marvel that most diverse opinions are held and professed on points which, in the judgment of all, are of fundamental importance There is unity of worship of a sort, inasmuch all join in the use of the legalized forms of devotion, deviating from them, however, according to each man's taste, so far as the fear of the law of the State will allow them But the unity is of an imperfect sort when two persons partake of the Lord's Supper, side by side, while one believes that the rite is a mere commemorative feast, but the other believes that it is the Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ There is no unity of government, for the Bishops acknowledge no common superior, unless it be the Sovereign, to whom each does homage on his appointment; and large sections both of clergy and laity openly defy the authority of the Bishops, in matters of discipline no less than in matters of faith, and this without eliciting more than mild expressions of regret from the rest of the body, who lament these unhappy divisions, but do not see that they indicate a fundamental defect in the whole system

As to sanctity, the same may be said of the Establishment as was said of the Dissenters; there are men and women within it who have grace to lead lives of ordinary goodness, of the type set forth in Dean Burgon's *Lives of Twelve Good Men* But cases are rare, or rather non-existent, where the religion of the Established Church has produced

the fruit of virtue of the kind that can be called heroic, and we hear nothing of any claim to miraculous power, which in fact it is usual to disclaim, without any reason being given for this falsification of the promise of Christ The Church of England uses the Apostles' Creed, and so claims the name Catholic, but there is no agreement among its members as to the meaning. By some the word, though occurring in the legalized formula, is simply ignored, for they glory in the name of Protestant as opposed to Catholic, and it would be dropped by them could this be done without exciting a commotion, just as many have dropped the use of the Athanasian Creed, which is obligatory upon them, but the doctrine of which they dislike, and many drop distasteful clauses of the legal form of administering the Eucharist, in spite of their solemn promise to use it Others would say that by claiming to be Catholics they meant that they held the same doctrine as was held by the Church of Christ at some remote period, when it seems to them to have been incorrupt; but as we pointed out in the last paragraph, this is not the sense in which the Church of Christ is Catholic. In that sense, the Protestants are not Catholic, for they are confined absolutely to the English race, and embrace no more than a fraction of this people The number of adherents however is but inconsiderable, even if we allow that all the offshoots from the English Establishment are sufficiently in sympathy with it to form one whole, they amount to about twenty millions, the other Protestants whom we have spoken

him: besides which they are content to remain in spiritual communion with men who hold doctrines on the Sacraments and other matters which are undoubtedly heretical. There is no unity of worship between these men and Rome, for Rome would pay no regard to testimonials given by the Anglican Bishops (see n. 223), nor would any Roman priest be a party to an Anglican receiving the Blessed Eucharist: and there is no pretence to unity of government, for there is no living governor to whom both parties submit This must suffice as a short account of a subject on which a large and increasing literature exists

As to Apostolicity, the members of the Church of England believe that they have this Note because they have a materially unbroken succession of Bishops from the days when the Bishops of England are acknowledged by all who care for the matter to have been Apostolical But the merely material succession is not enough, for it may be that a mere intruder may have been raised to the dignity by open force; or it may be that a holder of the office fell into undisguised heresy, and was followed by a line of successors of his own sort The succession will not avail unless it is formal and legitimate, as to which we have mentioned two tests (n 246), neither of which the Anglican succession can abide The Anglican Bishops are not recognized as such by the great body whom all acknowledge to be true and lawful Bishops and the mode in which they are appointed has undergone a change from that in use in the days when all agree

that the succession was lawful. At present, as of old, the Bishops are confirmed by the Archbishop of Canterbury but the Archbishop acts without any authority from Rome, whereas he formerly acted in virtue of the authority conferred upon him by the Pope who gave him the pallium. In proof of the sense entertained of the necessity of this investiture, we may cite the letter written in the year 805 by the English Bishops to Pope Leo III, in which they recognize the duty of personal application by the new Archbishop to the Holy See, but beg that he may be allowed to act by deputy (Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, 2, 559.) This change in the mode of appointment broke the succession, especially as the new line failed to obtain recognition by those who had recognized the old and thus the Apostolic origin was lost and a new start made, and this would have been so, even if the Episcopal consecration had been preserved, and even if the new line had not held doctrines on the number of the Sacraments and on the Sacrifice of the Mass which the old line denounced as heretical

253 *The Easterns* —We cannot afford space to say more of the Easterns than that they are plainly without the Note of Catholicity, for they show no tendency to spread beyond the countries where they originated

254 *The Roman Church Unity* —We have found that the Christian communions which do not acknowledge the supreme authority of Rome have not got those Notes which, as we have shown, must be found in the Church of Christ It remains to

Unity of worship is found in the Roman Church, for all recognize that the supreme act of worship is the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass offered by a priest who holds authority to celebrate from a Bishop in communion with the Holy See, and the names of the reigning Pope and of the Bishop are mentioned in the Canon of each Mass (n 223.) And all the Bishops who have this communion recognize the testimonial letters issued by his brethren who have the same communion The rite with which the Mass is offered is not everywhere the same, for the Holy See sanctions the Latin rite for some countries, the Greek for other districts, and so of the Coptic, Syriac, and Armenian. but it is recognized that these differences of rite do not hinder the essential oneness of the Sacrifice, and all is done in dependence upon the one centre of unity.

Communion with this same centre secures unity of government All the Bishops receive with reverence the directions which from time to time reach them from Rome, and each makes periodical visits to the "threshold of the Apostles" at longer or shorter intervals according to the distance: on which occasions he renders a full account of the state of the diocese under his care, and receives such advice and directions as the circumstances may require

255 *The Roman Church Sanctity.*—The Sanctity of the Roman Church receives attestation even from those who do not belong to her, as often as they let it be known that they look for a higher standard of virtue in the life of a Catholic than they look for

in members of other communions, illustrations of which feeling are of almost daily occurrence in the life of any one who lives in a mixed society of Catholics and Protestants. But the Holiness of the Roman Church shows itself also in the heroic sanctity of a great multitude of men and women within her communion This heroic sanctity is by no means confined to those on whom the solemn Decree of the Church has conferred the title of Saint or Blessed this honour is not allowed to any whose holiness cannot be proved to have reached the heroic standard· but this is not enough; it must be shown that the Divine will in the case has been made manifest by miracles As to miracles we shall speak directly, and we are not concerned with visions and other extraordinary marks of Divine favour· for the proofs of heroic sanctity may be studied without reference to them. These proofs are found in the lives that are written of holy persons, and especially in those founded on the authentic processes instituted when a petition is presented for the beatification of any Servant of God. the story will be found to show how under every conceivable variety of circumstances all the virtues suitable to the person's state were practised with a perfection far above what is usual even among good men, and however strange some of the recorded actions may seem to some readers, yet it will be seen that these are nothing but what look like excesses in what is good; and their character will be best judged by those whose own lives approach most nearly to the heroic standard

The processes in causes of canonization all contain full proof that miracles continue to be of frequent occurrence in the Church On a question of fact of this kind, we must refer to what we said on the general subject of Miracle in the First Treatise (nn 21—31) testimony proves the existence of certain facts, and our knowledge of the laws of nature proves that the co-existence of these facts admits of no natural explanation The value of the testimony must be judged in each case, but it is to be remarked that this is a matter on which no man is a fair judge who does not frankly and fully in his own mind admit that God can, when He sees fit, deviate from the rules by which it is His pleasure ordinarily to govern the universe, and further, that God did please to do so on certain occasions recorded in the Gospels One who does not admit this has no concern with any question regarding the Notes of the Church, for the whole of the present controversy is based on the authority of Scripture, which he declines to admit We conceive that the testimony in favour of certain miracles will be found absolutely conclusive by any one who approaches the subject with an open mind, using the great work of Benedict XIV., to which we have already referred. (n. 231, and see n 38)

256 *The Roman Church Catholicity*—That the Roman Church is Catholic will scarcely be questioned In its constitution there is nothing to confine it to certain languages or regions of the earth, and in point of fact it has penetrated everywhere in every case where the circumstances of the con-

version of a nation to Christianity is known from history, it will be found that the work was effected by missionaries working under the authority of Rome, and although there are some obscure instances on which history throws little light, yet in no single case can it be proved that the work was done independently of Roman mission The Annals of the Propagation of the Faith show how at the present day Roman missionaries are doing their work with zeal and success, and not seldom receive martyrdom as their reward, while the scanty result of the vast resources squandered on Protestant Missions is recognized by all who attend to the subject· lapse of time having done nothing to modify the effect of the overwhelming mass of evidence collected by Mr Marshall in his book on Christian Missions All authorities agree in estimating the members of the Roman Church as being at least as numerous as all other Christians put together· it follows that they many times outnumber the adherents of any single sect, and form far the most conspicuous body of Christians

257. *The Roman Church Apostolicity* —What was said when we spoke of unity of worship (n 254) sufficiently proves that the members of the hierarchy of the Roman Church in each generation receive their authority from the generation that went before, and in this way the Apostolic character of the Church is assured.

258 *Objections* —Various objections are raised against our doctrine on the Notes of the Church, and they will be found collected in large number by

Perrone (*Praelectiones, Tr. de Loco*, c. 3), but the replies to the great bulk of them have been anticipated in what we have said. It is unfortunately true that there is much corruption of morals among members of the Church, especially in those countries where she has been robbed and deprived of liberty by the action of the civil power; and this corruption may in some cases have been found among the holders of high office in the Church, but all this is perfectly consistent with what we have urged, that many members of the Church are in the grace of God, and that some lead lives of heroic sanctity. It is possible that some persons have been popularly reputed to be saints who have no right to the title, and that some events have been esteemed miraculous on insufficient grounds; but this does not prevent there being true saints and indubitable miracles. It is said that unity of faith in the Roman Church is secured by the use of force, and it is true that in Spain, the action of the civil power in suppressing heresy saved the country from the horrors of those religious wars which desolated so large a part of Europe, but there is no pretence for saying that the agreement of so vast a mass of men is a fruit of violence.

The last objection that we shall notice is a quibble on names: it is said that the Roman Church is the Church of a single city, and therefore cannot be Catholic or universal. We acknowledge that the terms "Roman Church" or "Roman Catholic Church" may be misunderstood, if their origin is not borne in mind. In truth the Church of Christ

is one and unique (n 215); it is therefore sufficiently denoted by the one word, the Church, with no epithet added, just as we speak of the sun, for there is one sun only in the heavens but men are found to claim the name of Church for other communities, and therefore, to prevent misunderstanding, it became usual to adopt epithets which serve to distinguish the true Church from her rivals, and the word Catholic, originally employed by way of protest against the Donatists (n. 238) was found to be suitable for the purpose It might still serve, were it not that it has been perverted from its original sense (n. 251), which however it still retains in the mouth of all who have not a cause to serve, just as was the case in the days of St. Augustine (*Contr Epist Manich* 1, 4 [5], *P L.* 42, 175), so, for the last three hundred years, the epithet Roman has often been employed, and it still serves its purpose, for the members of the one true Church alone are in communion with Rome It is in this communion with the common centre that the various local Churches find their unity in its perfection The phrase "the Roman Church" or "the Roman Catholic Church," is therefore unobjectionable, if it be understood as merely marking a character of the one true Church, but if it be taken to mean that one true Church is to be distinguished from another, it is to be rejected as involving a grievous error.

259 *Recapitulation*—In this chapter we have explained the importance of knowing which among the various Christian communities is the true Church

Treatise the Fifth.

The Roman Pontiff.

CHAPTER I.

POSITION OF THE POPE IN THE CHURCH.

260 *Plan of Treatise.*—In this Treatise we shall deal with the position of the Roman Pontiff, the Vicar of Christ and Head of the Church on earth. The Treatise is partly theological, so far as we found an argument on Scripture, but it is chiefly descriptive and historical, especially when the chief objections are dealt with, which the adversaries of the Catholic doctrine draw from history.

In the first chapter we shall describe the actual position held by the Pope in the Church at the present time, which has been held, without material change, at least for many centuries; and this will furnish a basis for an argument from prescription. We shall next consider the teaching of Holy Scripture and history concerning St Peter, the first in the line of Popes, and then the Primacy of the Pope and his Infallibility will be dealt with in two chapters. The relation of the Pope to the body of Bishops will be the subject of the next chapter,

with especial reference to the Bishops when assembled in a General Council The Treatise will be closed by the justification of the authoritative teaching on the subject of the Temporal Power.

261 *Subject of Chapter*—That the Bishop of the city of Rome holds a position in the Church of the present day essentially different from that held by any other Bishop is clear In the present chapter we propose to explain in what this difference consists, and to show in outline what is the machinery by which his power is exercised

262 *Who is the Pope?*—The prerogatives of the Pope, by Divine right, attach to the person who from time to time is Bishop of the See of Rome The name of Pope, which was formerly common to all the clergy, as is still the case in the East, has since the beginning of the sixth century, been appropriated in the West to the Roman Pontiff, the example having apparently been set by St Ennodius, Bishop of Pavia, who addresses a letter simply to "Pope Symmachus" (Epist 4, 1, *P.L* 63, 69) As often as a vacancy occurs, whether by resignation or by death, it is filled by election. In ancient times all Bishops were chosen by election, the electors being the principal clergy of the city, and in the case of the Roman See this discipline still prevails. Formerly, the lay people of Rome and the Emperors claimed to have some undefined share in the elections, the toleration of which claims may be explained by the consideration that it would usually be inexpedient for a person to be

elected who was not acceptable to those whom it would be his duty to govern in temporals but in 1179, Pope Alexander III. put the matter on its present footing, and since that date the right has belonged exclusively to the College of Cardinals, who are the Bishops of six sees in the neighbourhood of Rome, with the parish priests of the City itself, and certain deacons attached to the churches There is no completed election until the voices of two-thirds of the Cardinals present are given for the same person. The jurisdiction vests immediately on the completion of the election, for the Pope has no superior to confirm him in his office, as the Canon Law requires in the case of other elections The choice of the Cardinals is absolutely unfettered, and it is only in their discretion that since the election of the Fleming, Adrian VI , in 1522, this choice has always fallen upon an Italian; and it is also in their discretion that they have commonly respected the practice called Exclusiva or Veto According to this, the Sovereigns of Austria, France, and Spain, have been for some three centuries in the habit of nominating Cardinals to be their spokesmen, with the duty of signifying to the Conclave that the choice of some one particular person, who seemed likely to gain the required number of votes, would be unacceptable: and a claim of the same sort was sometimes put forward by other powerful states, as Naples and Venice But although it was generally felt to be wise to respect the wishes of one who perhaps had deserved well of the Church, and who at any rate had it in his power to do much mischief, yet no

strict right of Veto was ever recognized, and in fact Paul IV., in 1555, and Alexander VII., in 1655, were chosen in spite of the Veto of France.

The whole ceremonial of the election is most strictly regulated, one object of the rules being to secure the electors from all undue influence. We need not go into the details, which are to be found in many books; but it is to our purpose to observe that the whole matter is in the hands of the Church; and whenever the Church at large recognizes any man whatever as being Pope, that man is Pope, whatever may have been the circumstances that led to his being recognized. (See n. 211.) If it were true that, in 855, the choice of the electors fell upon one who though supposed to be a man was really a woman, this election would have been void, for women are incapable of jurisdiction in the Church; and so the Holy See would have continued vacant. If any one urge that a mistake of this sort might redound to the destruction of the Church, the answer is that the promise of Christ to be with His Church gives us assurance that the event will not occur. (See n. 192, viii.) But the story about Pope Joan is rejected by all historians: it may be enough to quote Gibbon (*Decline and Fall*, chapter 49), and Mosheim (2, 196, and 719.) If the person elected have not already received episcopal consecration, it is his duty to seek it.

The Pope being supreme can resign his office when he pleases, as was done by Benedict IX. in 1045, and by St. Peter Celestine in 1294; a bishop or parish priest, on the other hand, must obtain

leave of his superior before he can be quit of his charge. In the chapters of this Treatise on General Councils we shall show that no human power can depose a Pope who is once duly constituted in his office; and acceptance by the Church is a proof that such or such a person is lawful Pope.

263. *Papal functions classified.*—The Pope is Sovereign of the States of the Church, a function which is at present in abeyance, owing to the usurpation of a neighbouring Government. Before this usurpation, the form of government was an absolute monarchy, with an elective monarch, but the altogether exceptional circumstances hindered the existence of those evils which commonly attend that arrangement. The Canon Law was the basis of the law administered by the courts, and the people were happy under a mild and just administration, with light taxation and no compulsory military service, but were too ready to listen to the delusive promises made to them by the agents of envious neighbours. (See Maguire, *Pontificate of Pius IX.*) We shall describe the other functions which are now actually exercised by the Pope, dealing in successive paragraphs with his action as teacher and as governor, making special mention of what he does in relation to the Bishops of the Church, and to worship.

264. *Action of Pope as Teacher.*—In his capacity of teacher of the Church, the Pope sometimes solemnly defines that some doctrine is to be held as part of the Catholic faith, the denial of which from that time forward is heresy. This was done, for

example, by Pope Pius IX, when in 1854, he defined the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception (Denz. 1502), acting after consultation with the Bishops of the world, but without having gathered them into a Council and again in 1870, the same Pope, in the Vatican Council, issued the definition of his own Infallibility (Denz 1682) and other matters The Pope also speaks with infallible certainty on other matters which come within the scope of the teaching authority of the Church (n 209), for as we shall see when we treat of the matter, the infallibility of the Pope is the same as that of the Church (n 290) The Pope can exercise this infallibility by documents, having any form he pleases, so long as he makes his intention clear but besides these ex-cathedral utterances he often teaches his flock in a less authoritative manner, setting forth the doctrine which is ordinarily held upon some point, and basing some practical instruction upon the statement, but without any intention of defining any doubtful point. The same teaching office is exercised when propositions touching faith or morals are condemned, and forbidden with or without some note of censure as also by the practice of condemning books which contain false doctrine in rare cases books are prohibited as a disciplinary measure because they contain matter which, though not actually false, it is nevertheless inexpedient to publish.

265 *Papal Legislation*—The Pope as supreme governor of the Church exercises the right of legislation, laying down disciplinary laws which bind the

conscience of the faithful so far as the legislator pleases, and in the exercise of this prerogative he is not bound to the observance of any forms The nature of a law requires that it should be promulgated in some way, that is to say, the legislator must not keep his will locked in his own bosom, but must take some external step to make his will known. (See Buccaroni, *Theologia Moralis Quid sit lex.*) The ordinary course is that the law is published in Rome, by the agency of certain officials called cursores or messengers, and knowledge of this publication is conveyed to each Bishop by his agent instructed for the purpose, and by the Bishop communicated to the faithful under his charge It is understood to be the standing will of the Pontiff not to bind the people by disciplinary laws until they have been made known by the Bishop, and the Bishop has the right and duty of withholding the announcement if he sees that circumstances affecting his diocese make the law locally inexpedient, though generally useful he will communicate with Rome upon the matter, and await the decision of the Pontiff (See Bouix, *De Principiis Juris Canonici*, P 2, § 2, c 5)

There are certain points of discipline which, according to the common opinion, are of Divine and not of human institution. such is probably the religious observance of the weekly memory of the Resurrection of Christ, perhaps also the spring fast The Pope, therefore, could not wholly abrogate these institutions, though he can modify the observance of them as he sees fit. and his

legislative power is subject to no other restriction, every merely human law, though it may be ancient in the Church, and even of Apostolic origin, may be swept away by him who at the present day wields an authority equal if not superior to that of the Apostle or other man by whom the law was enacted Of course we are here speaking of the abstract authority, without reference to the likelihood of its being exercised and in the same way, there is no limit to the Papal prerogative of imposing new legislation, binding the members of the Church in all matters which are not against God's law

The power of legislation involves the right of punishing violations of the law by excommunication or other spiritual censures, as also by imprisonment and other forms of what in civil law are called secondary punishments the ecclesiastical authority never condemns to death, or to punishments which involve the shedding of blood

Cases will occur from time to time where grave inconvenience would arise from the enforcement of a law, which apart from exceptional circumstances is generally beneficial It belongs to the legislator to judge concerning these cases, and if necessary to grant a dispensation from the law. Of course this can be done only in matters of human law The practice of dispensing is often misrepresented, as if the Pope claimed power to make that right which was truly wrong· the reply is that dispensations are not granted except for things which would not be wrong were they not forbidden by the legislator: the dispensation removes the prohibition and

the thing is no longer wrong. There is probably no system of law in which dispensations are not in use: thus, in England, the Crown, acting under the authority of the Legislature, frequently grants licenses in mortmain, that is to say, dispenses a corporation in a particular case from the law which forbids it to hold land; a conveyance of land to a corporation is illegal, and involves forfeiture, unless a license has been obtained: if there be a license, the conveyance is no longer illegal.

Somewhat akin to dispensations are the graces granted occasionally by the Holy See, as when permission was given to the Kings of Hungary to have the ecclesiastical ornament, the Cross, carried before them, in acknowledgment of the good service against the infidel done by them on the frontiers of Christendom. In the same way, grants are frequently made of the favour of having Mass in a private house, and the like.

266 *The Pope and the Bishops.*—Although the system of government of the Church by Bishops is Divine and unalterable (nn. 196, 201), yet the details may be altered by the Supreme Pastor. Thus, he can suppress ancient dioceses and erect new ones, as was done by Pope Pius VII. in France in 1801, and by Pope Pius IX. in England in 1850. It belongs to him to modify, from time to time, the mode of appointment of Bishops, making such arrangements in each locality as are suited to its peculiar needs; and he determines which Bishops shall receive the pallium with the dignity and jurisdiction of a metropolitan or patriarch. He

has the right, which he does not now exercise, to require Bishops to provide his nominees with benefices, and this practice has had great efficacy in times past in fostering the Catholic spirit, and hindering the Church from degenerating into a bundle of national institutions If a Catholic historian see reason to think that at some particular period the right of provisions was grievously abused, he is quite at liberty to say so, for it would be a violation of his duty to try to make a pretence that there have never been abuses within the Papal Court· and few will deny that there was much abuse during the dreary seventy years while the Popes resided at Avignon (1307—1377. See Pastor, *History of the Popes* Eng Trans. 1, 72.) All ecclesiastical property is held subject to the directions of the Pope, and it cannot be licitly or validly alienated without his sanction, the violation of which principle has led to countless scandals The rule already mentioned (n 254) by which all Bishops are bound to render periodical accounts of the state of their dioceses goes far to prevent abuses in this matter The Pope also receives appeals from all local tribunals in the Church, and passes final judgment upon all causes

We may also mention here the power of the Pope to approve of new Religious Orders, or to regulate and even suppress those already in existence Besides having jurisdiction over all the faithful, the Pope is in a special manner the supreme prelate of every Religious Order, the members of which are subject to him in virtue of

their profession. He exercises his power in his discretion, with regard to time and place: a notable instance being the action of Pope Pius VII towards the Society of Jesus in 1814, compared with the action of Pope Clement XIV in 1773, towards the same Society.

267. *Liturgy.*—The Pope approves or disapproves devotions prepared for private use and regulates with great care the public worship of the Church. This worship is not absolutely the same everywhere, for while the substance of the Holy Sacrifice remains unchanged and unchangeable, the language and the rite employed vary with time and place. The variety in Breviaries and Pontificals is even greater than in Missals, and the Calendar is modified to suit each diocese and religious family. Connected with this matter is the reservation to the Pope of all causes of beatification and canonization, effected finally by Pope Urban VIII in 1634, since which time an early step in each cause has been to prove that no unauthorized public cultus has been offered to the servant of God whose cause is proposed. Failure to prove that the law of Urban has been observed is fatal to the cause.

268. *Mode of Exercise.*—It is evident that the burden of attending to all this business for the whole Church would be far beyond the powers of any one man, and the Divine institution of the episcopacy distributes a great part of the labour among the thousand or more Bishops who enjoy the communion of the Apostolic See. Each of these has, within his own diocese, certain *ordinary*

jurisdiction, that is to say, a certain authority which comes to him from the general law in virtue of the mere fact of his appointment to his office, and which he exercises in his own right and in his own name Moreover, the Bishops have commonly certain *extraordinary* jurisdiction conferred on them, not by the general law, but by the act of the Pope, and in exercising this they mention the source from which they derive it Thus, not only have the Bishops a jurisdiction of their own, but also a part of the jurisdiction of the Sovereign Pontiff is exercised through their medium; while at the same time, the jurisdiction of the Pontiff is also ordinary and immediate over the whole Church, and every one of her members so that the inferior clergy and the laity are subject to the ordinary jurisdiction both of the Pope and of the Bishop. It follows that the Pope has and exercises the right, in his discretion, to deal in the first instance, even with matters which are within the competence of the Bishop, and which commonly would not be brought before the Holy See, unless by way of appeal What is here said about jurisdiction belongs alike to the internal forum of the Sacrament of Penance, and to the external forum, or courts where the judge is merely man, and not acting directly in the place of God.

The Pope sometimes calls in the aid of the Bishops to assist him in that part of his work which is not laid upon them, as when he calls a General Council, or consults them by letter on doubtful points. But his principal reliance is on the body

of Cardinals, all of whom, unless they are Bishops in charge of dioceses, are bound to reside in Rome and attend the person of His Holiness In pursuance of an arrangement introduced by Pope Sixtus V (1585—1590), the Cardinals are distributed into a number of Congregations, to each of which are attached consultors and other officials, chosen from among the most learned and capable men that the Church affords A distinct class of business is assigned to each Congregation thus the Congregation of the Holy Office, or the Roman Inquisition, deals with questions that directly concern the faith: the Congregation of the Council decides cases that arise out of the disciplinary decrees of Trent the Congregations of the Bishops and Regulars and of the Propaganda have a care for the general business of the Catholic world, the one taking the older countries, while countries which have a recently established body of Bishops, or none at all, fall to the other The names of the Congregation of Rites and of Indulgences tell their own story, and there are others of less importance Occasionally new Congregations of a temporary character are instituted to dispose of business which is not of an ordinary description

When contentious business comes before any of the Congregations, lawyers are employed at the discretion of the parties The pleadings are in writing In cases where some exemption from the ordinary law is sought, a lawyer is appointed to argue against the applicant this is the position of the well-known Devil's Advocate in causes of

by men, Rome does not delay except where there is good reason for delay, and that in urgent cases her action is found to be prompt and decisive But it does not belong to the present work to go into this matter

Moreover, the system that is now in action is no modern growth it has lasted, without substantial change, for centuries It is true that the tightness of the bonds of discipline has varied in different ages of the Church, and that the Popes formerly left to the care of the Bishops certain matters which now, in view of increased facilities of communication, they see fit to reserve to themselves, but the Papal right even in these matters, was preserved and manifested by the practice of appeals and by occasional direct action Also in certain parts of the Church, especially in France, the free exercise of the right of the Pope to govern was obstructed by the civil power, aided by some subservient theologians, who maintained that no act of the Pope was valid within the country unless it were accepted by the Government These Gallican liberties as they were called really meant that the Church was to be the slave of the State, and their natural result would have been a schism, but things never went to that length, and as the Popes persisted in their claim of right, whatever moderation they might show in its exercise, obedience was yielded, though grudgingly, and Gallicanism as a theological system has long been dead (See n 304)

The Church then is now and has long been

governed as an absolute monarchy, and the monarch claims to govern by Divine right On the principle of prescription, this fact alone proves that the claim is well founded (n 83), for the whole Church by its submission shows that it allows the claim, and the whole Church cannot err on a matter vitally affecting her constitution; and further, if this form of government had not existed from the beginning, the monuments of history would have told us when and under what circumstances the change was introduced, whereas we find nothing of the kind There are instances where men of great weight in the Church complain of particular exercises of that Papal authority whose existence in the abstract they do not deny A memorable case of this is seen in the correspondence between St Cyprian of Carthage and Firmilian of Cæsarea (St Cyprian, Letter 75, *P L* 3, 1,202), complaining of the action of Pope St Stephen in reference to the controversy as to the validity of heretical Baptism · and we find other instances in the complaints made of the Holy See for entertaining appeals which were judged to be frivolous, or otherwise such as ought not to be received Many other cases of the same sort have been gathered together by the industry of the Gallican divines, the full discussion of which must be sought elsewhere, as in Jungmann's *Dissertations* and on the whole subject of the position of the Pope in early history, the book of Mr Allies, called *The Formation of Christendom*, is most instructive

There is one thing that history shows beyond doubt, namely, that appeals to Rome were in use

in the earliest times, and this sufficiently proves that the authority of the Court of Appeal was recognized, and it is impossible to assign any origin for the practice except primitive institution, for assuredly the Bishops of Rome during the first three centuries had no force at their command except that which the faith of Christians gave to their office And there is no trace of any part of their authority having been conferred upon them by any Council or other human authority. We must therefore apply the principle spoken of as St Augustine's That which the whole Church receives, when it has not been introduced by any Council but by constant usage, must be held to have come down from the Apostles

270 *Recapitulation* —In this chapter we have described the actual mode in which the Bishop of Rome exercises his authority to teach and govern the Church, and have pointed out the proof from prescription that this authority has no human origin, but is of Divine institution.

CHAPTER II.

WHO WAS ST. PETER?

271 *Subject of Chapter.*—In the present chapter we propose to consider what we learn from Scripture and history concerning St Peter We shall find that certain prerogatives were conferred upon this Prince of the Apostles by Christ, which are identical with those which, as we have seen, are claimed and exercised by the Bishops of Rome, who are his successors not in the episcopal See alone, but also in his position of Head of the Church and Vicar of Christ on earth. Thus we shall show how we find in Scripture that basis and Divine origin of the Papal authority, of the existence of which we were assured by the argument from prescription

272 *St Peter, Bishop of Rome.*—That St Peter was at his death Bishop of Rome is not a matter of Divine revelation, but it is an historical truth so closely connected with dogma as to come within the range of the teaching authority of the Church it is a dogmatic fact (n 211), and we have it defined with infallible certainty by the Vatican Council (Constit *De Eccl.* c 2, Denz 1670) that St Peter still lives and presides and judges in the person of

his successors, the Bishops of that Holy See of Rome, which he founded and consecrated by the shedding of his blood The historical testimony to this fact is clear, to the effect that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome, and suffered death there in the year 67, during the persecution of Nero. According to the common opinion his episcopate had begun twenty-five years before, but there are some difficulties in the way of this view into which it is needless to enter the length of his reign as Pope at Rome is immaterial We proceed to give a very short selection from the many ancient testimonies that are available. More will be found in Jungmann's First Dissertation

First we will mention Firmilian, whose angry letter to St Cyprian we have already quoted in another connection (n 269) He says that St Stephen, by his conduct, does dishonour to the Apostle St Peter, whose successor he boasts to be (*P.L* 3, 1217) Had Firmilian not known that the boast was well founded, he would not, writing in so angry a mood, have failed to charge his adversary with his falsehood. This was written about the year 260, and is, it will be observed, a testimony from the East St Cyprian agrees with his friend, for he speaks of the Roman See as "Peter's place," (Epists 2, 8, *Ad Antonian*, *P L* 3, 797), and describes Rome as "the chair of Peter, the principal Church, the source of the unity of the priesthood" (Epists 55, 14, *Ad Cornel*, *P L* 3, 844) There are earlier testimonies from Tertullian (*De Præscript*, c 36, *P L* 2 19), from Origen (apud Euseb *Hist Eccl* 3, 1, *P.G*

20, 215) in the second century we have St Irenæus (*Contr Hær* 3, 3, *P G* 7, 848) and St. Denys of Corinth (Euseb *Hist Eccl* 2, 25, *P G* 20, 208) and others while in the first century the fact that St Peter founded the Church at Rome, where he suffered death, is testified by St. Clement, himself Pope and friend of St Paul (Philipp iv. 3), whose letter to the Christians of Corinth is extant and has always been held in high esteem in the Church (*Ad Cor* c 5, *P G.* 1, 217)

Although we do not find in Holy Scripture any express mention of St Peter having been at Rome, yet curiously there is a verse in which that city is not named and which nevertheless affords proof that he was at one time resident in the capital of the world more convincing perhaps than is afforded by such direct testimonies as we have given specimens of The verse occurs at the end of the first Epistle of St Peter (1 St. Peter v 13) and runs as follows "The Church that is in Babylon elected together with you, saluteth you, and so doth my son Mark" St Peter then wrote from a place that he calls Babylon what place was this? There was a place in Egypt, not far from Old Cairo bearing the name, but no one thinks that St Peter wrote from there, and no other place is known to have been called Babylon, except the once great and famous city on the Euphrates The future downfall of this mighty seat of empire had been foretold long before by Isaias (xiii xiv &c), and the just punishment of its oppression of the people of God and of its exceeding cruelty (Duke of Argyll,

Unseen Foundations, 141) had fallen upon it long before the days of St Peter after the hour of its capture by the Medes and Elamites it sank into insignificance, and there is no trace of a Christian congregation ever being gathered on its site. But in the mouths of Jews and Christians alike the name of Babylon had been transferred from the old city to its rival in oppression and wickedness that stood on the banks of the Tiber, and there is no room for doubt that by the Babylon of the Apocalypse (xiv 8, &c) is meant the city of Rome. And down to the time of the Reformation it was the unanimous judgment of all writers who have expressed an opinion that the Babylon of St. Peter's Epistle is this same Rome Whether the view is thought to be well or ill-founded, the unwonted agreement of so many commentators proves convincingly that they believed that St Peter had lived at Rome The details of the proof may be seen in Father Cornely's Special Introduction to the Epistle.

But the most persuasive argument both for the residence of St Peter at Rome and for his Roman episcopate is of a negative character. The records that have been preserved concerning the labours and deaths of the Apostles are but scanty, and probably few particulars were ever committed to writing beyond those that have come down to us Accordingly, great uncertainty prevails as to the Churches they founded and ruled as Bishops, and many communities were anxious to claim the honour of an Apostolic origin (n 245), the result being that many conflicting accounts were current

concerning each of the Apostles There is one case only in which the point is of even the slightest importance, and this case is also the sole exception to the rule of discordant traditions no Church but Rome has ever claimed to have been governed by St Peter at his death.

The difficulties that are put forward in opposition to the belief that St Peter was Bishop of Rome at his death are partly chronological and lose their point when it is observed that we assert nothing as to the length of time that he held the See, and partly critical, turning on doubts as to the genuineness of some of the ancient testimonies the discussion of these doubts cannot be given here, but we may remark that they do not touch the argument derived from the word Babylon, nor that from the absence of all claim by other Churches

273 *The First of the Apostles*—It is generally recognized that Simon, the son of Jona, afterwards called Peter, is portrayed in the Gospels as holding a position of eminence among the Apostles Thus we read that when first brought to our Lord, he received the promise that his name should be changed (St John i 42), which promise was afterwards fulfilled, the change being represented as a special blessing, given in reward of his lively spirit of faith (St Matt. xvi 18) Now, we find in Holy Scripture, that when God gave a new name to any person it was a sign that the person was entering on some new position in the Divine economy, as when Abram became Abraham, the father of many nations, the father of the faithful (Genesis

xvii. 5.) Also the new name given to Simon was in itself a name of the highest honour, for it is a name claimed by our Lord Himself, for Peter means stone (Isaias xxvi. 16, Psalm cxvii 22 as explained in St. Matt xxi 42, Acts iv 11) What this new name signified we shall consider hereafter. Christ also treated St. Peter as in some sense on an equality with Himself, commanding him to pay the tribute "for Me and thee" (St Matt. xvii 26), and this favour seems to have excited the jealousy of the other Apostles (St. Matt xviii. 1) St Peter was one of the three admitted to the solemn scene of the Transfiguration (St Matt xvii 1) he was present at the raising of the daughter of Jairus (St Mark v 37), and in the Garden when our Lord made His prayer in preparation for His Passion (St Matt xxvi 37.) After these instances of distinguished favour it is scarcely necessary to say more but we may refer to some places where St Peter acted as spokesman of the Apostles (St Matt xix 28, xv 15, xvii 4, xviii 21, &c), and others where he is mentioned with a turn of phrase which marks him out from the rest of the company (St Matt x 2, St. Mark xvi 7, Acts ii 14, &c) We naturally expect to hear more about an Apostle who was thus peculiarly favoured by his Master

274 *A dignity promised*—We learn from St Matthew's Gospel (xvi 13—20) that our Lord, when the end of His sojourn on earth was approaching, took an opportunity of eliciting from St Peter an avowal of the great central truth which he had

gathered, without being expressly taught The account runs as follows

13 And Jesus came into the quarters of Cesarea Philippi, and He asked His disciples, saying: Whom do men say that the Son of Man is?

14 But they said Some John the Baptist, and other some Elias, and others Jeremias or one of the Prophets

15 Jesus saith to them: But whom do you say that I am?

16 Simon Peter answered and said: Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.

17 And Jesus answering said to him: Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but My Father Who is in Heaven

18. And I say to thee, that thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it

19 And I will give to thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in Heaven and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in Heaven

20 Then He commanded His disciples that they should tell no one that He was Jesus, the Christ

It is clear that these verses contain a promise of some kind of dignity or function or position, whatever its nature, to be given to some one we reserve for the two following chapters the consideration of the question what was involved in the promised

favour, and inquire here only as to the recipient of the promise It may seem strange that any question should exist upon the subject, for the texts seem to express with sufficient clearness that the promise is made to Peter alone· but the exigences of controversy have led some Catholics who were not fully loyal to the Holy See to maintain that the promise is made to the Apostles collectively, in the person of Peter that the Apostles represented the Church, and that the Church in turn put the power which it had received into the hands of Peter and his successors, the Popes We, on the other hand, maintain that the promise was made to Peter alone, and that the authority of the Pope comes immediately from God and is not given to him by the Church The point now has been defined by the Church. (*Auct Fid* 2 and 3, Denz 1365, 1366, and the Vatican Council, Sess 4, cap. 1, Denz 1668)

That the promise was made to the individual is shown by the change of number in the pronoun, the "you" of verse 15, changing to "thou" in verse 18, and it is to be observed that verse 17 is plainly personal Also, verse 18 interprets the new personal name Peter, and corresponds to the personal avowal of verse 16: the promise is a reward for this avowal, and it would be a mockery to offer to reward a man for his personal merit by a favour to a large body of persons There are cases, as we have already pointed out (n 273), where St Peter spoke in answer to a question put to the whole body of the Apostles, but when this is so, our Lord

addresses His further remark to the whole body, and not to the spokesman. (St Matt xix 26—28, St John vi 68—71)

Some Protestant commentators, catching at straws, endeavour to make out that the words Peter and Rock do not mean the same thing, and that therefore the words "will build" contain no promise at all, but merely express an intention with which Peter has no special concern. They think that the Rock on which the Church is to be built is either the faith of Peter, or is Christ Himself. This last view makes Christ to have been guilty of heartless mockery, raising hopes and then frustrating them, but the view that the Rock is the faith of Peter is an interpretation which, though inadequate, is not untrue, and as such, has been adopted by many Catholic commentators But the interpretation is inadequate for the reasons already given, the Rock must be the person Peter, but it is Peter considered not merely as a man, but as one whose simplicity of faith led him to adopt in his heart the teaching of his Master, tremendous as was the mystery involved in that teaching, and whose love made him bold and unhesitating in proclaiming he truth that he had learned The Rock is neither Peter apart from his belief, not the belief apart from Peter, but it is the believing Peter

A linguistic ground is sometimes adduced for the distinction between Peter (*Πέτρος*, Petrus), and the Rock (*Πέτρα*, Petra) It is observed that though the body of the two words is the same in St Matthew's Greek, just as it is in

the Latin, yet the terminations differ, and it is suggested that this difference indicates a difference of meaning. The diversity, however, admits of less violent explanation. The Greek word for Rock chances to have a feminine termination, and it cannot be applied to a man without producing a ludicrous effect to avoid this inconvenience, the Evangelist altered the termination of the proper name, but retained the other word in the usual form It is to be observed that the Greek of St Matthew contains the only original record of these words of Christ that has come down to us (n. 110), but it is not likely that Christ spoke Greek on this occasion · it is far more probable that He used a language almost identical with what is now called Syriac, from which it differed merely as one dialect differs from another and we possess a Syriac translation of St Matthew's Gospel, made certainly within a single century after the conversation of our Lord with St Peter in this version, the words for Peter and Rock are absolutely identical Any one who opens the place in a Syriac Bible may, without knowing a single letter of the language, convince himself that the same word occurs twice in the verse, without the smallest difference. It is pronounced *Keepho,* and corresponds to Cephas The French language similarly admits the use of the identically same form, Pierre, in both places other modern vernaculars, like the Greek and Latin, require some modification to suit the difference of gender.

275 *Assistance promised* —Christ does not entrust

any office to men without giving them the aids necessary to enable them to do their work, and so we are not surprised to find that the promise that we have been considering is followed up by another, giving the assurance of assistance. It is read in St Luke's Gospel (xxii 31, 32), and was spoken in the course of the Last Supper

31 And the Lord said Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you that he may sift you as wheat

32 But I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not; and thou, being once converted, confirm thy brethren.

We here have the promise of our Lord that He has prayed in a special manner that the faith of Peter may not fail in the time when grievous temptation comes upon him: and there can be no doubt that the words are addressed to Peter personally and not to the whole company of the Apostles as represented by him the rest of the Apostles are included among the brethren whom Peter is to confirm We shall see hereafter (chapters iii and iv) what is the full meaning of the promise here given

It may be remarked that the translation "being converted" is not free from doubt there is some authority for taking the word to mean "in turn." (Venerable Bede quoted without disapproval by Cornelius à Lapide and others) Father Palmieri (*De Rom. Pont.* p 356) urges that as no reference had yet been made to the impending fall of Peter, it was out of place to tell him what he was to

do when he had recovered the grace of God: besides which, his work of confirming was not to begin at once, but only after he had received the final commission of which we are to speak next. The difference is of no great importance

276 *The dignity conferred.*—The dignity which had been promised to St Peter, and for the due bearing of which he was to receive special assistance, was actually conferred on him by Christ, after His Resurrection, when He stood on the shore of the Sea of Galilee, and was seen and recognized by St. John and St Peter, and five other of the disciples The account is read in St John's Gospel (xxi 15—17).

15 When, therefore, they had dined, Jesus saith to Simon Peter Simon, son of John, lovest thou Me more than these? He saith to Him, Yea, Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee He saith to him Feed My lambs

16 He saith to him again, Simon, son of John lovest thou Me? He saith to Him, Yea, Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee. He saith to him, Feed My lambs

17 He said to him the third time, Simon, son of John, lovest thou Me? Peter was grieved because He said to him the third time, Lovest thou Me? And he said to Him, Lord, Thou knowest all things Thou knowest that I love Thee He said to him, Feed My sheep

In reference to this passage it is to be observed that our translation, following the Vulgate Latin, uses the same word, Feed, in all the three verses

This exactly represents the word employed in the Greek original (*βόσκε*) in the verses 16 and 18: but in verse 17, St. John uses a different word (*ποίμαινε*), which is rather wider than "Feed," for it means, "Be a shepherd to," to feed the flock is a principal part of the work of a shepherd, but it is not the whole it also belongs to him to guide and guard them. Also we may remark that though the ordinary Greek text uses the same word (*πρόβατα*), translated "sheep," both in verse 16 and verse 17; yet there is reason to believe that the true reading in verse 16 would give a word (*προβάτια*), signifying animals of an age intermediate between the lambs (*ἀρνία*) of verse 16 and the full-grown sheep of verse 18 Here again the difference, though interesting, is of little import.

277 *The Acts and Epistles.*—As to the conduct of the Apostles after the coming of the Holy Ghost (Act ii 1), we learn little from Holy Scripture, except in the cases of St Peter and St Paul We have a large number of Epistles written by St Paul, and the greater part of the book of the Acts is concerned with his journeys and preaching: but with the exception of his so called rebuke of St Peter (Galat ii 11—14), which will be considered presently, there is no trace of his having occupied any position of pre-eminence among the band of Apostles It is true that the Roman Pontiffs sometimes warn such as contemn their authority that they will incur the wrath of the holy Apostles Peter and Paul (see for example the close of the Bull, *Ineffabilis Deus*, December 8, 1854, defining the

dogma of the Immaculate Conception), and that the two names are often coupled together on other occasions: but the Popes have never professed to hold their authority as successors to St. Paul, but always trace it to St. Peter: and the frequency with which the names are coupled together is sufficiently accounted for by the fact that they are honoured as the joint principal patrons of the Church of the city where they suffered death There is, therefore, no foundation for the fancy put forward by the Jansenists, with the view of lowering the authority of the Holy See, that St Peter and St Paul formed, in some sense, a joint head of the Church. (See Denz 965)

St. Peter, on the other hand, is exhibited in the Acts as occupying a position of unmistakable prominence. It is he whose preaching gathers the very first converts into the Church (Acts ii 14, 41), and he continued to be the speaker on other occasions (iii. 12, iv. 8), so that St. Chrysostom was right in calling him "the mouth that spoke for all" (Hom 4, *In Act* n 3, *P G.* 60, 46) St Peter receives and executes the commission to guard Christians against errors into which they were liable to fall. (Acts x 9, 34, 47, xv 7) St Peter was foremost in the working of those miracles by which the preaching of the new faith was confirmed (Acts iii 6, v. 13—16), where we see that the multitude, taught doubtless by experience, believed that the passing of the shadow of Peter had power to cure, just as the touch of the garment of our Lord worked immediate cure (St Mark v. 24—34, and compare St John

xiv 12), as did the bones of the Prophet Eliseus (4 Kings xiii 21.) So much for the action of St. Peter in spreading the knowledge of the true faith, we find him also prominent in attending to the internal affairs of the Church It is he who takes the lead among the hundred and twenty (Acts i 15), requiring them to join in choosing a successor to Judas, and if it be asked why he did not make the appointment by his own authority, the answer is that he wished to avoid odium and the risk of being charged with favouritism such at least is the explanation given by St Chrysostom in the Homily immediately preceding that just quoted (Hom 3, *In Act.* n. 2; *P.G.* 60, 35), in which prudent condescension he has been imitated by his successors, who often listen to the wishes of the local clergy when a Bishop is to be appointed It was St Peter who condemned the first heretic, Simon (Acts viii. 18—24), and who was, in the words of St. Jerome, "chief mover of the decree that after the Gospel the law of Moses was no longer to be observed" (Acts xv., and St Jerome, Epist 112, n 8, *P L.* 22, 920), and, to mention no more, it was at his word that God by miracle enforced the law of the Church concerning vows in the case of Ananias and Sapphira (Acts v. 1—11, and see the overwhelming proof in Cornelius à Lapide, *ad loc*)

278 *St Paul and St Peter.*—We have said enough perhaps to show that St. Peter held a position of some kind of pre-eminence in the early Church, and it only remains to notice the one passage which has been quoted as tending in the opposite direction

It occurs in the Epistle of St Paul to the Galatians. He tells us that (i 18, 19) he went to Jerusalem to see Peter, but other of the Apostles he saw none save James the brother of the Lord and it is to be observed that the word used with reference to St Peter, and translated "see" (ἱστορῆσαι), is different from that employed directly afterwards of St James (εἶδον) The first word does not occur elsewhere in the Scripture, but is not uncommon in profane authors, and is used of visits to impressive objects, such as an oracle (Eurip *Ion*, 1547), and it is employed by Josephus, a contemporary of St Paul, when he tells that he had seen the pillar of salt representing Lot's wife (*Antiq. Jud* i. 11, 4) St. Jerome (*ad loc.; P.L.* 26, 339) remarks that St Paul did not visit St. Peter merely in order to see what sort of a man he was: as, whether he was bald, as tradition relates The word used of St James is the common word for "saw." And in the second chapter we have the following

11 But when Cephas was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed

12. For before that some came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles: but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them who were of the circumcision.

13 And to his dissimulation the rest of the Jews assented, so that Barnabas also was led away by them into that dissimulation

14 But when I saw they walked not uprightly unto the truth of the Gospel, I said to Cephas

before them all: If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of the Gentiles, and not as the Jews do, how dost thou compel the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?

The history, in other words, was this Some converts from Judaism continued to observe the Mosaic Law as to meats (Levit ii), which the Council of Jerusalem, following the judgment of St Peter, with the full concurrence of St Paul, declared not to be of obligation, while it did not forbid the practice (Acts xv. 1—29, and compare Galat v 3 and n 220) St. Peter, being at Antioch, and living in company with Gentile converts, made a practice of eating freely in company with them, but when certain converts of Jewish birth came from Jerusalem, St Peter finding that they were in the habit of observing the law, judged it best to conform to their usage St. Paul, learning this, thought that the practice of St Peter might lead the Gentiles into the mistake of thinking that they were bound to the law, an error which was only too prevalent and against which he was never tired of protesting Under these circumstances, he remonstrated with St Peter on his conduct, in the words given in verse 14

This history has been considered to show that St Paul regarded himself as the superior, or at least the equal, of St Peter whom he rebuked. also that it proves St Peter to have fallen into heresy. Several remarks occur.

(*a*) The use that may be made of this passage in opposition to Catholic doctrine is no new discovery

it was familiar to the Ebionite heretics (*Clementines*, 17, 19; *P.G* 2, 401), to the heathen philosopher Porphyry (St Jerome, *Prol ad Galat*, *P L* 26, 310), to the Marcionites, and to the Apostate Emperor, Julian (Hurter, *Compendium*, 1, 366)

(*b*) Some have thought that the Cephas mentioned in the text was a different person from the Apostle St. Peter, although these are the forms of the same name in the two languages in use in Palestine (St. John 1. 42), and there is no trace of the existence of any other person of the name This idea is supported by Clement of Alexandria (in Euseb *H E* 1, 12, *P G* 20, 117), but it now finds favour with few or none, and it need not detain us.

(*c*) Others say that the supposed rebuke was merely fictitious, and that the whole scene was pre-arranged, in order to impress the true doctrine as to the Jewish law more forcibly on the minds of all. This view attributes to the Apostles a course of double-dealing wholly inconsistent with the simplicity that ought to mark Christian preaching, and although it has the high authority of St Jerome (*Comment in Galat* 2, 11, *P L* 26, 339), who says that it originated with Origen (Epist 112, 5 *P.L.* 22, 919), and was supported in a homily of St Chrysostom on the place (*P G* 51, 375), it elicited an indignant letter of remonstrance from St. Augustine (Epist 40, 3, *P.L.* 33, 155), and is now generally rejected

(*d*) From what has been said in these three paragraphs it is plain that Catholic and heretic,

apostate and heathen, agreed in thinking that an injury would be done to the Christian cause if it were established that St Peter had a superior or an equal in the Church their comments, therefore, afford strong support to the doctrine that we are upholding

(*e*) There is no pretence for saying that St. Peter failed in faith, for not a word is said showing that he had fallen away from the belief which he had himself formulated at Jerusalem (Acts xv. 10) The most that can be charged against him is a want of prudence, and it does not concern us to discuss the truth of this charge.

(*f*) The conduct of St Paul does not imply superiority or even equality, for the duty of fraternal correction extends to inferiors, in regard to their superiors, so that subjects are not only allowed on a fitting occasion, to correct the r prelates, but are even bound to do so, as St Thomas teaches (*Sum Theol* 2 2 q 33 aa. 3 and 4) It would excite no surprise at the present day to learn that one of the Cardinals called the attention of the Pope to the likelihood of scandal arising from some course of conduct which he had adopted without due consideration The faithful counsellor would be praised But what St Paul did is no more than that Cardinal would do

(*g*) The example of St Peter is said to "compel" the Gentiles to live as Jews a most forcible expression, showing the influence that St Peter possessed the contrary example of St Paul had no power to "compel" the faithful to imitate him.

Thus the only passage of Scripture which can be quoted against the pre-eminence of St Peter really affords cogent proof of his unique and high position

279 *Recapitulation* — In this very important chapter we have seen that St Peter died Bishop of Rome, that his pre-eminence among the Apostles is indicated in the Scripture in various ways that a great dignity was first promised and then conferred upon him, with a promise of special assistance and this doctrine is confirmed by the only passage which has even an appearance of being opposed to it It remains to see what was involved in the dignity of which we speak.

CHAPTER III.

THE PRIMACY.

280 *Subject of the Chapter.*—In the first chapter of this Treatise we saw that the successive Bishops of Rome in fact exercise, and have long exercised, a primacy in the Church in the second chapter we showed that St Peter, the first Bishop of Rome, received certain special and peculiar dignities and favours from Christ, and that after the Ascension he occupied a distinguished position among the Apostles We have now to consider more particularly what was involved in the prerogatives granted to St Peter, and we shall find that they included, among other things, a primacy, not of honour alone, but of jurisdiction, over the whole Church, granted by God, and not conferred by man and that the monarchial constitution of the Church, thus established, was no merely temporary arrangement which died with the first monarch, but that it is an essential part of the constitution of the Church as now existing, and as it will continue to the end of time

In the following chapter we shall show that these prerogatives included also the gift of Infallibility which is enjoyed in virtue of their office by

the Popes, when speaking under certain circumstances that will be explained

These two points of doctrine, the Primacy of Divine right and the Infallibility, have been the chief subjects of controversy ever since the Reformation, and it is scarcely too much to say that a full half of the theological literature of the last three-and-a-half centuries has been a commentary upon the three classical texts which we set forth in the last chapter. Our treatment of the immense subject must necessarily be very short. We shall try to set forth the Catholic argument with all possible clearness, and in such a way as to answer by anticipation the chief difficulties that are urged against our doctrine These difficulties can be turned into a great variety of shapes, and sometimes our doctrine is attacked with cavils that do not deserve the name of difficulties It were endless to attempt to deal with all these, and we must be content to refer to the immense collection put together by the industry of Dr Murray, in the third volume of his great work, *De Ecclesia*, where each receives its appropriate answer in scholastic form Waterworth's *Faith of Catholics*, to which we have often referred, will be found peculiarly useful as collecting the passages of the Fathers that have a bearing upon the controversy

281 *The Centre of Unity*—We have seen (nn 213—227) how perfect is the unity which Christ would have in His Church, a unity comparable to the perfect unity of the Divine Father and His Consubstantial Son (St John xvii 21), with unity

of faith, of worship and of government · and we showed also (n 254) that this unity is found in that body of Christians who look up to the Bishop of Rome as their Head, and in none other But we were somewhat hampered in that discussion, for we had not then established that the Pope holds his position by a Divine right, and his authority might, so far as our argument had gone, have been a mutable arrangement, originating perhaps in the free choice of the Bishops, and subject to be overturned by the authority that brought it into being. But the eternal Oneness of the Triune God would be poorly represented by an institution composed of many elements, united for the time in virtue of a mutable agreement, but liable to fall to pieces as soon as this agreement came to an end We are, therefore, prepared to find that the Divine Wisdom devised and the Divine Goodness carried out some more excellent plan for securing to the Church that perfection of unity which it was destined to enjoy.

We may consider various suggestions as to the means by which this unity might have been secured and first, it is said by some that the Holy Scripture, if duly used, will suffice for the purpose But this theory supposes that all are at one as to the list of books composing the Scripture, and as to their special character, which is far from being the case, as we saw in our third Treatise Also, the Scripture at best can but teach the faith, it cannot help to unity of worship or of government, and in the absence of an authentic interpreter it is so hard to understand, that men derive from it the most diverse

conclusions on the most vital points, although there is no reason to doubt that they have made faithful use of their opportunities of gathering the meaning Nor can the power of the State be considered as a divinely appointed means of securing religious unity, for the State has its own work to do, which is totally distinct from the end of the Church (nn 175, 179, 180) it cannot show any commission to teach religious doctrine, and experience shows that civil governors, even if they call themselves Christians, are far from agreeing in their faith The agreement of Christian people at large is not the bond of unity, for it is they who require to be kept in the one true way, and they are under a divinely instituted hierarchy, as we have shown. (nn 199—203)

A notion which is widely entertained among those who do not accept the Catholic doctrine of the centre of unity, makes unity to depend upon the agreeing voice of the Bishops If by this is intended that we must listen to the voice of the Bishops of antiquity, it is enough to reply that these are dead, and can speak to us only through their writings and these writings lend themselves to diverse interpretations no less readily than the Scriptures themselves. If the episcopate of the present day is meant, we need an external test to determine who are the legitimate members of that body for there may be false bishops, no less than false prophets (St Matt xxiv 24) and false apostles (2 Cor. xi 13), and if two among them differ, as may well happen, whether on a point of faith, or as

to the bounds of their dioceses or any other point of government, who is to decide the controversy?

But if the supreme power of teaching and governing is by Divine appointment, in the hands of one living man, these difficulties find no place He is living and accessible and is able to make his meaning clear beyond doubt, and if all recognize that his decisions are final and binding upon them, then is unity secured in its perfection It is not well for man to anticipate what God *must* do to attain a certain end, for this is to pit his puny wisdom against the Infinite but we may say that these considerations prepare us not to be surprised if we find that the unity of the Church is secured by the authority of an individual living man as centre of unity

282. *Peter the Foundation* —We saw (n. 274) that Christ promised (St Matt xvi 18) to build His Church upon St Peter we have now to show that by this metaphorical but most expressive language, the promise was given to St Peter of the primacy of jurisdiction in the Church This follows plainly for the foundation of a building is the most indispensable part of the building, being that on which the strength of the whole structure mainly depends, and in the choice of which the wisdom of the builder is chiefly shown (See St Matt v 24, Psalm xxxix 3) The foundation does not merely support the building, but it has an independent completeness of its own, so that when the foundation is laid, the builder feels that a substantial part of his work has been done; and further, that the extent and

general character of the building is unalterably determined no further extension is possible, for what does not rest on the foundation is not part of the house

We learn, therefore, that the whole Church depends upon St Peter, while he himself does not derive support from that which rests upon him His position is unique, just as the foundation stands alone and is independent of the rest If all the house were removed the foundation would remain but if the foundation be shaken no part of the house can stand

283 *The Promise of the Keys*—In the verse following that which we have been considering (St Matt xvi. 19), the promise is made to St Peter that the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven shall be given to him, and we must see what this implies The phrase Kingdom of Heaven is perpetually used for the Church Militant (St Matt x 9, and in chapter xiii and elsewhere frequently), so that in the verse we are considering it must have the same meaning as the words "My Church" in the preceding verse, and we observe that the discourse in both cases concerns the whole of the object, and not a part only Further, the phrase "give the keys," implies that the object is put entirely at the disposal of the recipient. To hand over the key of a house is not merely a conventional sign of yielding possession the connection is natural, for he that has the key is master He can enter and go out at his pleasure, admit guests and exclude those whom he does not wish to receive. The key is regarded

as the instrument of imprisonment, and this explains the second half of the verse, where the power of binding and loosing is promised to St. Peter he can bind and throw into prison, he can loose and unlock the door It is remarked that there are three ways in which the souls of men may be said to be bound by the bond of law, of sin, and of punishment St Peter is to exercise the first in his capacity of legislator, in whose power is included the power to dispense from law the second concerns the administration of the Sacrament of Penance, in which absolution from sin is granted or withheld, according to the judgment formed by the confessor concerning the dispositions of the penitent the third bond is relaxed when Indulgences are granted But these matters will be discussed in their own place, when we treat of the Sacraments

284 *The Confirmer* —The text which we quoted from St Luke (xxii 31, 32, n 265) assures us that the faith of Peter will not fail, for the prayer of Christ is always efficacious (St John ii 42), and that the faith of others, especially of his brethren the Apostles, depends upon his support We thus see that he has a Divine commission to guide others in the faith, however eminent their station in the Church, and thus is the centre of unity of faith but the bearing of the text on Infallibility is more direct than on Primacy

285. *The Office of Shepherd* —In the last of our three texts taken from St John's Gospel (xxi 15—17, n 266), St Peter is made the Shepherd of the sheep and lambs of Christ, and in this appointment

we cannot but see the fulfilment of the promises recorded by St Matthew (xvi. 18, 19), it is the same office that is spoken of under the figures of the Foundation, the Bearer of the Keys, and the Shepherd The office of a shepherd includes the work of feeding the sheep, or at least leading them to the places where they will find healthful pasture, to keep the flock together, giving it unity (St John x 16) he defends the flock against the wolf (St John x. 11, 12, Acts xx 29) all which and other duties are set forth in the 34th chapter of the Book of Ezechiel The charge entrusted to St Peter is therefore that he exercise these and analogous functions in the care of the flock of Christ, the members of His Church. The distinction of sheep and lambs, for both of which St Peter is to do the work of shepherd, emphasizes the extent of his jurisdiction We say that the whole Church is built upon Peter, because we have no right to introduce distinctions which are not indicated in the text in the charge to be a shepherd the use of the two words, sheep and lambs, expressly negatives any limitation to the extent of the authority. And in fact, if any exception were to be made, it would extend at least to the Apostles, who were then present; yet not a word is said indicating that they, or any others, were exempted

This doctrine is perfectly consistent with what we hold, that the Apostles had by Divine appointment a universal jurisdiction in the Church, such as is also possessed by the collective episcopate at the present day Each Catholic Bishop exercises

the pastoral office in regard to the faithful of his diocese, and each of the Apostles did the same for all the world but they did so in dependence upon St. Peter, and this dependence was none the less real, although they had individually a Divine guarantee that they should not fall away, just as the collective episcopate is indefectible Union with Peter was the condition of their perseverance, and they were assured that the condition would never be broken

286 *Papal Primacy.*—So far we have given an outline of the proof from Scripture of the truth taught and declared by the Vatican Council (Sess. 4, cap 1, Denz 1668) that "according to the testimony of the Gospel, a primacy of jurisdiction over the whole Church was promised immediately and directly to the Blessed Peter the Apostle, and was conferred upon him" We now go on to show the truth of what is taught by the same Council in the same Session (Sess 4, cap 2, Denz 1670) that "what the Chief Pastor and great Shepherd of the sheep, the Lord Jesus Christ, instituted in the person of Blessed Peter the Apostle, for the perpetual welfare and lasting good of the Church, this must, by the institution of Christ, last for ever in the Church which, being founded upon a rock, shall remain ever firm to the end of the world" and again in the Canon "If any one say that it is not by the institution of Christ our Lord Himself, that is by Divine right, that Blessed Peter has an unbroken line of successors in the Primacy over the whole Church, or that the Roman Pontiff is

not the successor of Blessed Peter in the same Primacy, let him be anathema" (Denz 1671) The doctrine here expressed merely taught with a little more fulness what was already an article of the Catholic faith, for the Council of Florence, in 1439, defined that Blessed Peter received from Christ full power of feeding, ruling, and governing the Universal Church (Denz 589)

That the Primacy was to be as lasting as the Church itself follows from the terms in which it is spoken of in the Gospel, for the need of the foundation to a house and of a shepherd to the flock is no temporary need, but will continue and be pressing as long as the house is to stand, or the flock is to be kept together And if this be granted, it will not be denied that the Roman Pontiff is the Primate There is no one else on whose behalf the claim is made, whereas from the earliest days the claim was made practically by the successive Popes, and no rival ever presented himself. The action of the Pope in the Church, as already described (nn. 262—267) is absolutely unique there is no pretence for ascribing the like action to any other Bishop When difficult questions arise in any part of the Church, the decisions of the Popes are sought, and that for the sake of their office, and not on account of eminent personal attainments, such as led to similar inquiries being addressed to individuals of great reputation, as St Basil and St. Augustine The causes of Bishops and others, from the East as well as from all the West, were brought before the

Papal tribunal, and there judged with authority, and all who fell under suspicion were anxious to clear themselves at Rome, and no cause was hopeless until it had been rejected at Rome The history of the Church is filled with illustrations of what has just been said: the proof is cumulative, and to adduce one or two particular instances would merely weaken it, the details will be found in abundance in the *Formation of Christendom* by Mr Allies, in Bottalla's *The Pope and the Church*, and countless other books

The difficulties that are brought against the doctrine of the Primacy are partly founded on cases like that of Firmilian, of which we have already spoken (nn. 269, 272), but they are often of a negative character it is said that there is no ancient authority to show that the Popes exercised such or such a prerogative The answer is, the imperfection of history we do not know all that has been done in the Church, and for early times we have nothing but a scrap here and a chance fragment there. How true this is will be best appreciated by one who is familiar with the *Reliquiæ Antiquæ* of Dr Routh, he will see the patchwork of which the earliest history is made up But there is no doubt that in earlier times the Popes left much business in the hands of the Bishops and other local authorities which afterwards in more peaceful days they reserved to themselves: the moderation of a Superior in the use of his authority affords but a weak ground for showing that this authority is not claimed by him and acknowledged to be his.

287 *The Universal Bishop*.—A difficulty of a positive nature is raised by certain passages in the works of St Gregory the Great, where he repudiates the title of Universal Bishop, which would seem to be due to the Pope in virtue of the Primacy. It is true that according to the doctrine which has been set out and proved, no member of the Church is left without the pastoral care of Peter and his successors, or exempt from their authority. And yet this care and this authority cannot be distinguished from that which each individual Bishop has in his diocese, and so there is a sense in which the Pope claims to have direct and immediate episcopal authority in the whole of the Church there is no person, no place, to which his care and authority does not extend. It is not clear therefore why the Pope should not allow himself to be called, and call himself, the Universal Bishop. This title had been given by the General Council of Chalcedon to Pope St Leo the Great, and this Pope had called himself Bishop of the Roman and Universal Church: yet St Gregory calls the title a profane novelty, which had never been taken by his predecessors The explanation is that the title Universal Bishop admits of two senses it may mean sole Bishop, or it may mean that the holder has the episcopal care extending to all the Church, but not so as to exclude the authority of each Bishop in his diocese St Gregory was moved by learning that the title had been taken by the Patriarch of Constantinople, John, surnamed the Faster, and as the Pope conceived, in the former sense Whether he was correct or not, there is no doubt of the view he took,

for he again and again speaks of John as wishing to be called *sole* Bishop (Epist 5, 18, to John of Constantinople, *P L* 77, 738, and Epist 5, 71, *Ad Constantianam*, *P L.* 77, 749) It was therefore in this sense that St Gregory rejected the title with indignation, preferring to be called, Servant of the Servants of God (St Gregory to the citizens of Rome, Epist 13, 1, *P L.* 77, 1253) There was no sense in which the title could belong to John, but in the second sense that we have explained the power expressed by it was claimed and exercised by St Gregory, it is enough to quote his distinct assertion that what was undoubtedly the second See of the world in influence, the Church of Constantinople, was subject to the Apostolic See (Epist 9, 12, to John of Syracuse, *P L.* 77, 957), and in another place he asks, What Bishop is not subject to it? (Epist 9, 59, to the same; *P L.* 77, 996) It is plain, therefore, that in declining the ambiguous title St Gregory did not mean to disclaim the authority which, rightly understood, it implied

288 *Recapitulation*—We can say no more on this immense and much controverted subject It must suffice that we have shown the advantage that must arise to the Church from the possession of a personal centre of unity that the three famous texts discussed in the last chapter prove that St Peter was constituted by Christ to be centre, and govern the whole Church, that this power has passed to his successors, the Bishops of Rome, by whom it has been exercised who are not sole Bishops, although they have by Divine right the immediate episcopal charge over the whole Church.

CHAPTER IV.

INFALLIBILITY.

289. *Subject of the Chapter.*—It will be convenient to begin this chapter by setting forth and explaining the decree adopted by the Council of the Vatican by which the Infallibility of the Pope, which might previously have been denied without the guilt of heresy, became an article of the Catholic faith We shall then show how the doctrine is contained in Scripture, and indicate very briefly the nature of the proof of the same from tradition after which the difficulties that have been brought against the doctrine will be dealt with

290 *Infallibility defined* —In the Acts of the Council of the Vatican, held in 1870 (Sess 4, cap. 4), we find the following "The Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra*, that is to say, when in the exercise of his office of pastor and teacher of all Christians he in virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority defines that a doctrine on faith and morals is to be held by the whole Church, by the assistance of God promised to him in the person of Blessed Peter, has that infallibility with which it was the will of our Divine Redeemer that His Church should be furnished in defining a doctrine

on faith or morals, and that therefore these definitions of the Roman Pontiff, of themselves and not through the consent of the Church, are irreformable"

The assembly which adopted this decree is recognized as a General Council by the whole Church (see n. 209), and the decree itself is accepted as conclusive by the whole Church (See n 208) It follows that the decree comes to us with the authority of the infallible Church, and cannot be questioned without forfeiture of the name of Catholic This decree, together with the decrees concerning the Primacy, which come to us on the same authority, put an end to a controversy which had been freely agitated in Catholic schools, and which, as so often happens (n. 113), had cleared up ambiguities and ended by establishing the truth on a firm basis, never to be shaken The spirit of nationalism, however good within its own province, has always been opposed to the spirit of Catholicity, and it has repeatedly happened that kings who boasted that they were true sons of the Church, have striven to use her power as an instrument for the attainment of their own ends, and have undertaken to regulate spiritual matters directly by their own authority or through the agency of subservient ecclesiastics whom they have raised to positions of wealth and influence In these cases, the authority of the Popes has been the great obstacle in the way of the temporal ruler, and has been the means used by Divine Providence to hinder the Church from becoming merely a part of the machinery used by the

State for its own ends, as happens in countries which have shaken off obedience to Rome The struggles of the Popes with the Byzantine Emperors and with the successors of Charlemagne fill a large place in Church history· and the only too successful efforts of the Kings of France to extort practical independence of Rome were continued down to the time when the Revolution of 1789 swept away all existing institutions (n 304) It was in France that it was first found convenient to devise a theological basis for pretensions which had previously been put forward chiefly on practical grounds, and after the Great Schism (1377—1417, n. 218) a school arose, known from the country of its origin as the Gallican, which maintained that the Pope received his authority from the Church, and which consistently went on to hold that dogmatic decrees issued by the Pope were not infallible in themselves, but only in virtue of their acceptance by the Church Attention being called to the subject, the matter was studied, and the theologians of Italy, and of Rome itself, were led to the conclusion that the Papal Primacy was of Divine institution, and that the Pope was in virtue of his office infallible. These views were dubbed by the French divines as Ultramontane, while the name Cisalpine was applied to the doctrines that prevailed on the north of the Alps The controversy was far-reaching, touching principles that are at the very foundation of the relations between God and man, and it had the happy result of leading to a deep and critical study of history, which cannot but bring out the truth

more clearly. No Gallican ever doubted that the voice of the Catholic episcopate, even when dispersed, was the infallible voice of the Church nor that communion with Rome was the necessary condition of the right to the character of a Catholic Bishop It follows that on Gallican principles the doctrine on the Papal Primacy and Infallibility asserted at the Vatican Council is infallibly defined as an article of the Catholic faith

It is to be observed that the decree speaks of the Roman Pontiff, not merely of the See of Rome of the living man, not of the voiceless entity It explains the meaning of the phrase *ex cathedra* with a plainness that leaves nothing to be desired an ex-cathedral utterance is an act of teaching, not an act of government, still less of personal conduct and it does not include every act of teaching by the Pope, but only those where he teaches the whole Church, on a point of faith or morals, and this in the exercise of his supreme Apostolic authority Whether any particular utterance fulfils these conditions is a point on which ordinarily there is no room for doubt and if ever any difficulty arises, it is solved by a consideration of all the circumstances from which the intention of the Pontiff can be gathered and if, as is conceivably possible, the doubt remain, then the utterance is not known to be infallibly binding The difficulty here glanced at is of no more practical import than are the doubts felt by English constitutional lawyers whether certain official utterances of the King are or are not to be classed as Acts of Parliament. (See Stubbs, *Consti*

History, 2, 224) The decree teaches us that the extent of Papal Infallibility is the same as that of the Church (n 209) Infallibility is not secured by any system of Divine inspiration, for the Papal decrees have the Pope for their author, whereas the Author of the inspired Scriptures is God Himself (n 136) Neither is the Pope infallible by virtue of Divine revelations made to him such revelations, were they given, would be no more than private revelations (n. 22), and therefore not binding upon the Church. The Pope does not attain to his knowledge of the truth without the use of ordinary means, prayer, study, consultation, and the like, along with which goes a peculiar enlightenment from the Holy Spirit, given to him on account of his office, the Vatican definition assures us that he will not utter an ex-cathedral decree until his diligent and enlightened use of these means has resulted in his coming to a correct conclusion on the point before him.

There are some persons who think that they can learn Catholic doctrine by studying an English dictionary, and these observe that the word *infallible* is connected with *failure* and with *fall*, hence they conclude that according to our doctrine no Pope ever fails in prudence or falls into sin These are quite mistaken The infallible character belongs to ex-cathedral utterances, in the sense explained It has nothing to do with prudence in conduct, though we believe that the Church has been secured from destruction by the more than human prudence that has guided her governors, neither has it anything

to do with the moral character of the Pope, for lessons of sanctity may come from the mouth of a wicked man (St Matt xxiii 3), and even if there be any truth at the bottom of the grossly exaggerated stories that are current concerning the private lives of some of the Popes, we are merely led to recognize the Divine guidance which has hindered these men from teaching *ex cathedra* the bad principles which are supposed to have shaped their personal conduct.

291. *Proofs of Infallibility*.—The argument by which we have shown that the three great Petrine passages (nn. 282—285) prove that the Bishops of Rome have by Divine right a Primacy of jurisdiction over the Church, applies also to establish their Infallibility, so that little need be said on this head. It is enough to point out that the passage from St Luke (xxii. 31, 32) is conclusive on this head. St Peter is to confirm his brethren, and the prayer of Christ, that shall not fail of effect, has been offered that his own faith fail not. He is, therefore, to confirm his brethren, that is, the Apostles and the whole Church, in their faith, and is furnished with the necessary means for the accomplishment of this work: he that is to teach must first know. Further, the office of shepherd committed to St Peter over the sheep and lambs of Christ (St John xxi. 15—17), includes the work of feeding: and in the language of Scripture, the food is the doctrine revealed by God (1 Cor. iii. 2, 1 St Peter ii. 2, &c.), the action of St Peter will therefore be liable to lead the sheep to poisonous pastures, to their ruin, unless the Chief Shepherd provides, as He

can, that His Vicar shall not be deceived What is here said of St. Peter applies to his successors for the same reasons as prove the perpetuity of the Primacy. (n. 286) All members of the Church, therefore, at all times are by Divine appointment under the care of St Peter and his successors, and bound to accept the lessons of faith that he teaches them, just as they are bound to hear the Church, and as God could not impose on them a duty to accept error, the faith that he teaches must be the truth.

As to the proof of the Papal Infallibility from tradition, it is so full that it is impossible to set it forth in a short compass It is not found so much in express declarations· there was no need to declare formally that which everybody knew and accepted as a matter of course but we have casual allusions, such as when St Leo remarks in passing that the faith of Peter fails not even in his unworthy heir (St Leo, Serm. 3, *P L* 54, 147) But the doctrine is taught practically, when the Pope decides unhesitatingly and with a tone of authority, the questions on points of faith which were referred to him from all parts of the Church, the cases will be found in profusion in Bottalla on the Infallibility, and every book on the subject. This practical teaching is more conclusive than any express statements, for its meaning is less open to question, and we must especially notice its negative side There is absolutely no trace of an appeal from the Papal decision on a matter of faith to any higher tribunal, appeals from the Pope to a future General

Council are sometimes heard of, especially in times of schism, and they were forbidden by Pope Pius II, in 1459, expressly on the ground of the supreme and full power that he had received as heir of Peter (Constit. *Execrabilis*) but these appeals concerned discipline, not doctrine

We may notice a passage of St Thomas which shows how undoubtingly the doctrine of the Infallibility was held and tacitly assumed as admitted by this great theologian of the thirteenth century. he lived shortly before the rise of the Gallican school He discusses (*Summ Theol* 2. 2 q 1 art 10) the question whether it belongs to the Supreme Pontiff to draw up Creeds, and he answers in the affirmative, for this work must fall to him who has authority to determine what is of faith, to be held with unswerving faith by all And this belongs to the Pontiff, to whom all greater and more difficult questions in the Church are referred The text from St Luke on confirming the brethren (xxii 32) is then quoted, and it is pointed out that unless he that presides over the whole Church were able to decide questions of faith, it would be impossible to avoid the divisions which the Apostle deprecates (1 Cor 1. 10)

292 *Objections*—The arguments against Papal Infallibility employed by the Gallican school, and which have been eagerly borrowed from them by later theologians, in and out of the Church, were not so much theological as historical. and the theologian, dealing with this matter, is forced to follow them, and leaving his proper subject to consider

what are the teachings of history He enters on this inquiry with full assurance what the result will be, if it is properly conducted, for truth cannot be opposed to truth but aware of the imperfection of the historical record, he is not unprepared to be confronted with difficulties, the full elucidation of which is impossible with our present materials, and he is content to repel the attacks made upon the doctrine which he has established on quite other than historical grounds, and does not expect to find proof of the truth of his belief in every passage of history which his opponents have selected as tending to support their view.

It is impossible in this place to enter on historical controversy, which necessarily runs to great length, involving the transcription, comparison, and critical discussion of the original documents Fortunately, it is often possible to show from the facts admitted by all, that on the face of these facts, the objection is groundless The objector often tries to produce instances where Popes have taught heresy *ex cathedra*, and if he succeeded in one instance in proving his point, our doctrine would, we confess, be untenable but in every case it will be found on examination either that the teaching is not shown to have been ex-cathedral, or that it cannot be proved to have been heretical We can here do no more than mention the principal instances that are brought up, and indicate very briefly the lines on which a defence may be made

I Some think that the fall of St Peter is in some way a proof that the Pope is not infallible.

But the answer is plain: St Peter had not at the time of his fall received his commission to feed the flock of Christ, and therefore he was not Pope, and perhaps the words "being converted" point to the time when his work was to commence besides which, when he told the doorkeeper that he did not know the Man, he certainly was not uttering a dogmatic statement, intended to teach the whole Church: he was only showing his own private weakness

II. St. Peter submitted his doctrine to the Council of Jerusalem, and St Leo in the same way submitted his doctrine on the Incarnation to be discussed by the Council of Chalcedon But there is a use in the investigation of the grounds of a doctrine, even when there is no doubt as to what the result of the investigation will be the examination makes the truth appear more clearly.

III Pope St. Stephen was opposed by St. Cyprian, but most certainly St Stephen never defined any heretical doctrine: the error, whatever it may have been, was not on his side.

IV. Pope Liberius subscribed an heretical formula But, even if we accept the truth of all that is said against him, he did no more than accept a formula of faith on the Blessed Trinity, in which there was nothing positively heretical, although the omission from it of the word "consubstantial," which was the badge of the Catholics against the Arians, was taken as a mark of favour to the enemies of the Nicene faith. And at the worst, he did this when not free, but in a state of banishment

from his see, and there is no pretence for saying that he taught Arian doctrine *ex cathedra*

V. Pope Honorius was anathematized as a heretic by the Fourth General Council of Constantinople Not as a heretic, in the proper sense, but as having negligently permitted the spread of heresy, and so being involved in the same condemnation as the actual heretics Honorius wrote a letter to Sergius, the Monothelite Patriarch of Constantinople, in which, as the event proved, he did not make a sufficiently firm protest against the heresy but it cannot be shown that the letter itself contained heresy, and even were it otherwise, the letter was a purely private document, and neither in form nor in substance or in mode of issue showed any trace of being intended for the instruction of the Universal Church

VI. It is sometimes said that the Popes owed their power to a forgery, the False Decretals This work became known early in the ninth century, and purported to be a collection, put together by one Isidore, of decretal letters of Popes, such as make up the greater part of the body of the Canon Law The general tendency of these decretals is to represent the Pope as supreme governor, to whom appeals may be brought by Bishops and the inferior clergy who are aggrieved by the action of the metropolitans The decretals are attributed to Popes who reigned in the very earliest days of the Church, and in form they are undoubted forgeries, for they were certainly put into shape about the time when they became known. But in substance

they were old, though not so old as they pretended to be, and the proof is easy, for the authors who have demonstrated the forgery in form do so by showing that the utterances attributed to the early Popes are not theirs, but are found in the genuine works of Popes of the fourth and following centuries, so that they were old in the days of Isidore Besides this, our proofs of the Primacy and Infallibility are drawn from Scripture and early tradition, and not from the False Decretals · and we have seen (n 291) St Thomas rests his doctrine as to the position and authority of the Popes, not on any forgery, but on the Sacred Scripture.

VII. In the case of Galileo, the Holy See condemned as heretical and opposed to Scripture an astronomical doctrine which is now universally accepted. On this much debated question, it may safely be said that no man can prove that the note of heresy was attached by the Pope himself to the physical doctrine The proof of this would require it to be shown that the Pope acted personally, for the gift of Infallibility cannot be delegated to any other person that he acted with the intention of exercising his supreme apostolic authority to teach the Church and, lastly and most especially, that the purpose of the decree was to condemn the doctrine and not merely to prohibit the books containing it A doctrinal utterance is not proved to be *ex-cathedral* by its occurrence among the motives for a disciplinary decree and this appears to have been the case with the decree against Galileo, which therefore does not conflict with our doctrine The

action of the Holy See on this matter may be defended on higher ground than what is here taken, but what has been said suffices to show that nothing that was done in the case is inconsistent with the doctrine of Papal Infallibility. The remaining cases of alleged ex-cathedral errors are of minor importance.

293 *Recapitulation.*—Our chief work in this chapter has been to explain what is the true doctrine defined by the Vatican Council on the personal Infallibility of the Pope. When this is understood, there is not much difficulty in giving the proof of the doctrine from Scripture, while the proof from tradition is too bulky for these pages The chief historical difficulties against the doctrine are shortly answered at the close of the chapter.

CHAPTER V.

THE POPE AND THE BISHOPS.

291 *Subject of Chapter.*—We have seen that in accordance with the decrees of the Vatican Council (n. 286), the Pope enjoys by Divine right a primacy of jurisdiction over the whole Church, which jurisdiction is immediate over every member of the Church, and therefore over the Bishops among the rest. There is therefore no longer any room for controversy on certain questions which in former times were warmly discussed, as to the relation of the Pope to a gathering of Bishops, especially if the gathering were such as to be morally representative of the whole Catholic world. Nevertheless, it will be well to devote a few pages to a short explanation of the doctrine and practice of the Church as to Councils, that the Divine rights of the Pope and the no less Divine right of the Episcopacy may be seen more clearly.

293 *Episcopal Government.*—We have seen (n. 200) that by the Divine constitution of the Church, there is in it a distinction of Teachers and Taught, Governors and Governed, and that the teaching and governing body is constituted by the Episcopate (n. 208), under the primacy of the Pope (n. 255). Catholic Bishops, therefore, who are known

by their communion with the Holy See, have authority to teach, and from the assured perennity of the Church (n 166), we know that this teaching body will never wholly fail; individual Bishops may lapse into heresy, as we know to have happened from time to time, but the body at large will never lapse Should such a lapse of the whole occur, the whole Church, which is bound to obey the teaching authority, would be led into error and ruined, which is impossible This is the same theological argument as was employed (n 291) to show how the infallibility of the Pope followed from his right to teach, and we may observe that even in the case of the Pope himself, there is no absolute certainty that he will never personally fall into heresy we know that he can never teach heresy *ex cathedra*, and most theologians believe with Suarez that he never will fall from the faith but their arguments do not command universal assent, and so it is well to remark that such a fall, disastrous as it would be, would not be of itself destructive to the Church, for if the lapse were private, the Church at large would be unaffected, but if it became notorious, then, it is held, the person would cease to be Pope, and the Holy See would be vacant but the maintainers of the doctrine that such a fall is possible admit the difficulty of explaining how the fact of the vacancy could be authentically ascertained.

Not only does this power belong to the whole Catholic episcopate, but each member of it has authority to teach and govern the faithful committed to him, exercising his office in subordination to the

supreme Pastor, the Roman Pontiff. The teaching of the Bishop must of course not be contrary to the faith of the Universal Church, and therefore is not irreformable, as is that of the Pope and in like manner, the legislation of the Bishop must not be in opposition to the legislation which binds the Universal Church, over which the Pope alone has power

296. *Councils*.—From the days of the Apostles downwards (Acts xv) it has been the practice of the Pastors of the Church from time to time, to meet together in smaller or larger numbers to deliberate on matters of common ecclesiastical interest, and to these assemblies the name of Council or Synod has been appropriated These Councils vary in character, according to the extent of the territory from which the members are drawn There are diocesan Councils, or Synods, consisting of the clergy of a single diocese, under their Bishop Provincial Synods are attended by the Bishops of an ecclesiastical province under the Metropolitan · and more rarely we hear of Plenary Synods, where the assembly of several provinces exercises jurisdiction over a whole nation Thus in old days there were Plenary Councils of Africa, and in our own time, Maynooth and Baltimore have been thus honoured by the Bishops of Ireland and the United States All these meetings exercise in the district to which they belong the same sort of authority as each Bishop enjoys in his own diocese, but on account of the numbers gathered together they naturally have great moral weight Occasionally their declarations on matters of faith

have been recognized as sound and useful, and so we meet with Canons of Councils of Carthage (n 151) and Toledo, quoted by theologians as having authority. These formal Councils, possessing the power of government, must be distinguished from informal assemblies, such as are often held by the Bishops of neighbouring dioceses, when they wish to agree on a common course of action, also from such gatherings as was seen in Rome in 1854, when a large number of Bishops chose the time appointed for the definition of the Immaculate Conception as the season for one of their periodical visits to the Threshold of the Apostles (n. 254) Also, these purely ecclesiastical meetings must not be confounded with the occasions when, in England, and probably in other countries, the clergy met at the instance of the King, for the purpose of taxation or other civil duties (As to the Convocation as distinct from Councils, see Stubbs' *Constitutional History*, 2, 194)

297. *Ecumenical Councils* —The word ecumenical means world-wide (*οἰκουμένη*), so that an Ecumenical Council is one gathered from the whole of the Church, and having authority over the whole The word General is often used as synonymous with Ecumenical, but some writers make a distinction, employing General to signify a Council which embraces the whole of the Greek-speaking or of the Latin-speaking Church. We shall use the two words indifferently

A General Council is of a totally different nature from the Councils spoken of in the last paragraph

It represents the whole body of the episcopate, and this, as we saw, cannot fail in the faith (n 295), but theologians are not agreed whether such a Council is a distinct seat of infallibility, or whether the Bishops are infallible only in virtue of the prerogative of the Roman Pontiff, with whom they are necessarily united, whichever doctrine be held, the practical consequences are the same

The assembly of a General Council is never absolutely necessary, unless we except the possible case of an ex-cathedral utterance being absolutely necessary in order to check some grave existing evil, while at the same time consultation with the assembled Bishops of the whole Church was needed in order that the Pontiff might assure himself of the truth (see n 290), and for securing the existence of the Church, for the Papal authority is, absolutely speaking, sufficient to cope with all difficulties, whether they touch faith or morals, heresy or schism the Pontiff can teach with infallible authority what men are bound to believe, and he can make such laws as the occasion may demand, and no Council can do more, for the free-wills of men are not constrained Occasions may, however, arise when the advance of some great evil cannot be effectually stayed by the authority of the Pope alone, and in these circumstances it is in a sense necessary for him to seek the moral support of the episcopate assembled in Council, but these occasions are not of frequent occurrence, and will probably be less frequent as time goes on, and exchange of sentiments grows easier without actual

meeting. The Church had existed for nearly three centuries before the first General Council met at Nice in 325 · and more than that period elapsed between the close of the Council of Trent in 1563 and the opening of the Council of the Vatican in 1869

The right to convoke a General Council belongs to the Roman Pontiff alone, for he alone has jurisdiction over the whole Church, entitling him to cal on all Bishops to meet together If a number of Bishops come together without the Papal summons or consent, they do not constitute a General Council, but their proceedings may subsequently attain to that authority, if they receive the ratification of the Holy See This was perhaps actually the case with the Council held at Constantinople in 381, which reckons as the first of the four General Councils which have been held in that city, and as the second Synod of the Universal Church Some writers, as Bouix, think that there is sufficient proof that the Emperor Theodosius, who in fact issued the summonses, acted with the previous approval of Pope St. Damasus, but the more common opinion of historians and canonists is that this Council was not ecumenical except by virtue of a subsequent Papal ratification of its acts Also, there is no distinct record of the previous Papal sanction to the gathering of Bishops at Nice in 325, but there is no doubt of Papal approval of their meeting, as we shall see directly · and we learn from Sozomen (*Hist Eccl* 3, 10, *P G* 67, 1057), that in the time of Pope Julius, about 340, the principle was well

recognized that nothing could be done validly without the assent of the Roman Pontiff, and he appealed to this principle without fear of contradiction, even in controversy with heretics who had held a sham council without leave from Rome. See also Socrates to the same effect (*Hist. Eccl.* 2, 17; *P.G.* 67, 220) and many other proofs of the same doctrine are found in the Acts of the Councils.

There is some controversy as to whether it is ever lawful for the Catholic Bishops to meet together to discuss the affairs of the Church without the Papal summons, and the question is discussed with reference to certain extreme and highly improbable cases. Those writers who believe it to be possible that the Pope should fall publicly into open heresy (n. 295) commonly hold that the vacancy in the Holy See must be declared by the Bishops gathered together at the summons of the Cardinals, or of some one from among their own number who takes the responsibility, and the same course would perhaps be lawful if an insoluble doubt arose as to the rights of two rival claimants to the Papacy, or if the Cardinals absolutely refused to hold an election to fill a vacancy. These speculative questions are interesting, as showing that every possibility has been foreseen and discussed. It must be borne in mind that the power which instituted the practice of the election of the Pope by the Cardinals, with certain formalities, can modify that practice, or abolish it altogether, if it seem expedient (n. 262), and we may believe that if a dying Pontiff foresaw that there was any risk of the

Cardinals being hindered from holding an election, by the violence of the civil power or otherwise, he would make suitable provision to meet the emergency.

The Primacy of the Roman Pontiff involves the right to preside in every General Council, which right he has exercised by himself and his legates Also, his right to summon the Council involves the right to fix the place of meeting, and to change it as seems expedient

The right to be summoned to a General Council belongs primarily to those who are immediately charged with the work of teaching and governing the faithful in their several dioceses, that is to say, to the Bishops having ordinary jurisdiction (n 268), they may have this right even before they have received the episcopal consecration. The Cardinals also are called, even when they are not Bishops, and in the Vatican Council there were some Bishops who had none but a delegated jurisdiction, as Vicars Apostolic, and the like All these are present as judges, with a decisive voice: but other persons are often admitted, such as Generals of Religious Orders, eminent theologians, and others, whose advice is likely to be useful, although they do not vote. Laymen have also been admitted, and treated with the honour due to their rank and merits, and we have an instance of this in the Council of Nice, when the assembled Fathers were addressed by the Emperor Constantine The practice as to admitting others than Bishops actually ruling dioceses has not been uniform.

The decisions of the Council are commonly arrived at by the votes of the individuals who are present with decisive voice: but sometimes the Fathers have been divided into nations, each nation voting among themselves, and the matter being decided by the majority of nations

The acts of a General Council have no binding force unless they are confirmed in some way by the Roman Pontiff, for the Bishops do not represent the Church except in virtue of their union with their head The confirmation of disciplinary laws may be given by legates deputed for the purpose, but dogmatic decrees must be confirmed by the Pope personally, for the prerogative of infallibility belongs to him alone, and cannot be deputed (n 268)

There are some cases of loose language being used, as if Councils of the Church had been convened by laymen, Emperors or others, who had also confirmed the Acts. There may have been instances of lawless usurpation of some such right; but the language of historians is commonly to be explained as referring to aid given by the civil power in facilitating the journeys of the Bishops to the place of meeting, providing for their maintenance, securing the public peace and adopting the necessary measures for enforcing the decisions arrived at The Church is, and always has been, wider than the dominions of any human ruler, and therefore it is impossible to maintain that it belongs to the civil power to command the attendance of the whole episcopate, besides which, to convoke and confirm would be an act of government, and as

such is reserved to the divinely instituted hierarchy (n 202)

298 *The Time of Schism* —We saw in a former place (p. 218) that between the years 1378 and 1417, a serious doubt existed as to the person of the successor of St. Peter There had been similar instances in earlier times of rival claimants to the Papacy, but there was no instance where the doubt as to the true succession had continued so long, or where there was so much difficulty in deciding which of the rivals had a true right to the obedience of the world This state of doubt whether the Holy See were full, and if so by what person it was filled, could not fail to weaken all ecclesiastical discipline and to be the occasion of the gravest abuses and men cast about for means of putting an end to so disastrous a state of things Many thought that a meeting should be held of all the Bishops of the Catholic world, and there is no doubt that the moral weight of an assembly of the kind would be likely to induce the rival claimants to resign whatever rights they had, and so it in fact proved. a Council was held at Constance, during which two of the claimants were induced to resign, and although a third persisted, he had no following, and was a palpable usurper, whose claim was disregarded the result was that the Holy See was undoubtedly vacant, and was filled by the election of Martin V., who was accepted as Pope by all parties

But if the claimants had remained obstinate, and refused to resign, what could have been done? This

was a question warmly debated at the time, and which cannot be said to have been finally settled for centuries The tendency of the Gallican school (n 290) was to hold that the assembled Bishops, forming what may be called the material of a General Council, had power superior to that of the Pope, however certain his title, and decrees were adopted by the assembly at Constance, before the end of the schism, by which such a right was claimed but these were at once repudiated by Pope Martin V , as soon as an undoubted election gave him an indisputable claim to the Papacy The claim has long been wholly untenable, and a long series of Papal utterances to this effect will be found in Denzinger, which have been put forth without provoking protest from the Church at large, and which therefore are binding, even according to Gallican teaching If any doubt were left, it is cleared up by the decree of the Ecumenical Council which we have quoted (n 286), according to which the power of the Pope, by Divine institution, extends directly and immediately to the whole Church, no exception being made of Bishops, whether scattered or assembled in one place There is therefore no provision in the constitution of the Church for the case of rival claimants of the Papacy, each having plausible arguments in favour of his right and commanding the obedience of a notable proportion of the Bishops who had been in communion with the Pope before the rise of the schism one may be the lawful Pope, and if so, no human authority is competent to depose him but the continuance of this

state of things would be destructive to the Church, and on this ground we believe that the providence of God will not allow it to occur. (n. 192, VIII)

299. *Recapitulation* —The account that has been given in this chapter of a subject of first-rate importance is most imperfect, for the matter belongs to works on history and canon law, while its strictly theological treatment would be very short the Vatican decree on the Primacy includes all that has to be said The way was prepared for this decree by the investigations of historians and canonists, and notices of the now obsolete controversies may be seen in Jungmann's *Dissertations* and Bouix *On the Pope*, and elsewhere We have given the results at which they arrive, without entering into the necessarily lengthy arguments by which they are supported, the due appraising of which requires a special training in the methods of each science, with knowledge of the value of the sources from which they draw The general conclusion is that the Bishops assembled by authority of the Pope have, and have always been held to have, an infallible authority in matters of faith, as well as power of legislation for the Universal Church, but that the decision whether such an assembly shall be held lies with the Pope alone, who also regulates all the details of the meeting, confirms or annuls the decrees as he sees fit, and who is himself not bound by any of the disciplinary proceedings of the Council.

CHAPTER VI.

THE TEMPORAL POWER.

300. *Subject of Chapter* —In this chapter we shall consider certain points of contact between the Church and Catholic States The chapter finds its place in this Treatise rather than in the Treatise on the Church, for these are matters in which action is usually taken by the Roman Pontiff, who is especially concerned in all that relates to his Temporal Power, from which important topic the chapter takes its title We speak of the relations of the Church to Catholic States, for the matter does not directly concern such States as do not profess to be guided by Catholic principles, but it is well that even such civil governors as disclaim the name of Catholic should understand what is the doctrine of the Church upon the subject they will learn that far from having anything to fear from the Church, every Civil State will find that it receives strong support from her action, and at the same time will see the wisdom of abstaining from such encroachments upon her domain as she cannot allow without compromising principles which she is bound to maintain immutable and sacred. Thus, the State cannot justify interfering with marriage, except in

its purely civil aspects, nor with religious or clerical vocations, nor with the religious education of children.

301. *Church and State* —We have already pointed out (nn. 173—180) that the Church and the Civil State are two distinct societies, to both of which every man should belong, in order to work for the attainment of his end, by the use of all his faculties The Church is unique, the State exists in various divisions, and it is in general a matter of indifference which of these divisions a particular man joins. The societies have different ends, which, however, are in perfect accord, due diligence in the pursuit of the one is perfectly consistent with the like diligence in the pursuit of the other, and in fact the two pursuits are mutually helpful. the more fully a man is actuated by Catholic principles, a more useful subject will he be in the State to which he belongs, being law-abiding, just, and charitable; and active in advancing all that is good for the community according to his opportunities. and he will find in the exercise of his civil and social duties a large opportunity of working out his supernatural end, by the service of God in the persons of his fellow-men

Further, the two societies can help each other by their corporate action, for each can legislate for its subjects in such a manner as, without departing from its own proper end, to promote the end of the other (see n 179), but, as there pointed out, a difficulty may arise if the governors of the one society take a view as to what is necessary, which

clashes with the view taken by the governors of the other society The difference will often be cleared up by mutual explanations, but in the last resort, the dispute must be settled by the consideration that the end of the Church is higher, and wider, than that of the State and again, the governors and the other members of the State are members of the Church, for we are speaking of Catholic States, and in this capacity they owe deference to the judgment of the governors of the Church, to whom they themselves, as Catholics, avow themselves subject

These very general principles admit of and require infinite modification in their application to particular states of circumstances

302 *Immunity* —An illustration of what we have been saying is found in the matter of immunity. It will conduce to the harmonious co-operation of Church and State if each society show respect to the position held by the officials of the other, and this principle is fully recognized by the Church If a person who is convicted of crime before the Church Court, hold a high position in the State, the ecclesiastical judge will have regard to this circumstance, and either remit the punishment altogether or at least inflict a lighter penalty than would otherwise have been awarded And in the case of temporal sovereigns this principle of prudence is enforced by positive law The Canon Law declares (Lib 1, *Decr* tit 33, c 4) that all princes and other men are subject to the Bishops of the diocese to which they belong, yet from the thirteenth century

downwards the Roman Pontiffs have been in the habit of granting to various princes an immunity from this jurisdiction, so that they should not be liable to excommunication save on the sentence of the Pope alone and canonists, true to their principle that favours are to be interpreted widely, gather that the will of the Pontiff is that all princes should enjoy this immunity the reasons for which it has been granted to some appearing to be applicable to all The power thus reserved to the Sovereign Pontiff has been used most sparingly, in spite of provocation and few men will deny that Pope Pius VII. was justified in proceeding to the last extremity when, in 1809, he issued an excommunication against the first Napoleon, a professing Catholic, whose power crumbled almost immediately

On the same principle, the Church strives to protect her officials from suffering unduly at the hands of the civil power. and although at the present day there is in some countries less need of this protection, and the rule regarding it has been much modified, as will be seen in our next section, yet there have been times when prejudice was rife, and no ecclesiastic could safely commit his cause tc the temporal tribunal The general Church law, therefore, forbids secular judges to force clerics to appear before them, unless they do so with the express or implied leave of the ecclesiastical superior, and before the change of discipline which will be explained directly, every accusation made against a clerk was dealt with in the Bishop's court.

this court heard the case, and if the charge was proved, passed and executed a sentence of imprisonment or such other secondary punishment as seemed to be called for If a culprit were brought before the secular courts and proved that he was a clerk, he was delivered up to the ecclesiastical tribunal to be dealt with and no doubt the same happened in other countries as in England, where the common lawyers complained grievously that clerks guilty of crime escaped with nominal punishment It was natural that the canonical penalties in use in the Bishop's court should seem nominal in the eyes of men accustomed to look upon it as a law of nature that the most trivial theft was to be punished with death, while other offences were visited with cruel public whippings or long and foul imprisonment. These same common lawyers, as time went on, became ashamed of their own system, and were glad to find an escape from its horrors in the fiction by which they allowed "benefit of clergy" to convicts who offered no other proof of their clerkship than the ability to read a prepared verse, usually the first verse of the Psalm *Miserere*. The long and curious history of this matter may be seen in Stephen's *History of the Criminal Law*, 1 459—472 Of course, the Bishops did not consider that the canonical immunity extended to men who had none but a sham qualification for clerkship and so these criminals escaped scot free We have here an instance of the enemies of the Church finding that their own ways of proceeding failed, so that they were driven to imitate the Church, and blundered in

the process· a process which Blackstone describes as "a noble alchemy, extracting rich medicines out of poisonous ingredients" (*Comm* 4, 371)

If the Bishop s court adjudged that a clerk had been guilty of a crime for which the canonical penalty was inadequate, it was not without the means of dealing duly with the case the criminal was "degraded" and handed over to the secular tribunal The ceremony of degradation may be seen in the Pontifical Its effect was to undo, so far as lay in the power of man, the effect of ordination, and this effect is symbolized by each step of the proceeding, the sacred vestments being taken away, the anointed fingers scraped, and so on This ceremony was gone through in the case of the wretched priest by whom Archbishop Sibour of Paris was murdered in the year 1857 The result is that the degraded priest loses all canonical privileges, and the exercise of all clerical functions becomes unlawful but the power of validly consecrating and absolving, under the necessary conditions, remains, for these depend on the presence of the priestly character, which once impressed on the soul, remains for ever.

303. *Concordats.*—We have said that the strict law of the Church, such as we have described, is not necessarily applicable at the present day· and an illustration of this is found in case of Concordats A Concordat is in the nature of a treaty between the Sovereign Pontiff as Supreme Governor of th Catholic Church and the Head of a State, whereby in consideration of certain undertakings on the part

of the civil ruler, the Pope expresses himself content to abstain from urging for the present certain of his rights with the result that all Catholics may with a safe conscience act in accordance with the Concordat The real effect of a Concordat, according to the intention of the Pontiff, is often wider than the words, and if any doubt arises concerning the binding effect of the Canon Law in any country, it must be solved by application to the Bishop, who if he sees fit, will obtain instructions from Rome Even in countries where no Concordat exists, we have the high authority of Cardinal D'Annibale (*Summ Theol* v 2, n 353) that in some respects, at least, the will of the Pontiff is not to urge the Canon Law but this question belongs to the Moralists

Also, we must refer to the Canonists for the discussion of the question how far the Pontiff is bound by a Concordat, or whether he can validly declare that he no longer means to abide by it, whether such a renunciation would be prudent or not must be judged by the circumstances, for it might be prudent in some extreme case where the State absolutely refused to carry out its part of the arrangement but the abstract question of the validity is an abstruse point, on which it does not concern us to enter.

304 *The Gallican Liberties*—We have spoken (n 283) of the Gallican school of theology, whose tendency was to represent the Pontiff as occupying a position of less authority than that which is assigned him by the Vatican Decree on the Primacy The lawyers of France adopted similar views, and

in their mouths, and in the mouths of such of the clergy as agreed with them, the power of the Church, or of the Pontiff as representing the Church, was much limited by certain rights which were asserted as belonging to the State There was some difference of opinion whether these rights should be claimed as inherent in the Civil State, or as belonging to the kings of France in virtue of some ancient grant. Conspicuous among these pretended rights was the claim that no indication of the will of the Pontiff, of whatever nature, was to take effect within the dominions of the kings of France until it had received the royal sanction different phases of this right were known as the *placitum regium* and the *exequatur*. Akin to these was the right claimed by the royal courts to entertain appeals from the decisions of the ecclesiastical judges, under pretence that these were abusing their authority—*tanquam ab abusu* In the times before the nature and Divine right of the Primacy were clearly defined, as being of Divine origin and incapable of restriction by human power, these so-called liberties were defended and approved by men who were undoubtedly learned and sincere Catholics; at the present day no defence of them could be possible, unless it were shown that they were part of an arrangement in the nature of a Concordat that had been made by some Pontiff, and was still in force Nothing of the kind can be shown for France or for any other country no sovereign would cut himself off from the possibility of free communication with his subjects

305. *The Temporal Power.*—We have seen (n. 291) why it is fitting that the rulers of each of the two societies, of Church and State, should so exercise their power as to show some regard for the position of those who hold office in the other, and that the Church is within her right in deciding how far this immunity is to extend, so that she holds it not merely through an act of comity on the part of the State, but as claiming something that is essentially her own. And plainly, if there be any Churchmen to whom this immunity belongs, the Sovereign Pontiff must be of the number, for as his jurisdiction is unlimited, so is the necessity for his perfect freedom absolute. The exercise of his high office would be impossible, were he liable, even in theory, to be summoned to plead his cause before temporal tribunals whose power was wielded by men who were his subjects in the spiritual society. And since it is a clear point of Catholic doctrine that the Church should be governed by a Pontiff clothed with the prerogatives that we have described, no Catholic can question the right of the Pope to be exempt from the jurisdiction of the tribunals of any civil power; the duty imposed upon the Pontiff of governing the whole Church implies a right to that exemption from common obligations without which this duty can hardly, or not at all, be performed.

What is here said of the immunity from the jurisdiction of civil tribunals which belongs to the Pope in virtue of his divinely instituted office, must be said also of the Cardinals and others who are

around him, and without whose aid it would be impossible for him to govern the Church (n 268)

It follows that the Pope and his court must either reside in a territory over which the head of some nation claims to exercise jurisdiction, while professing to allow full immunity to the Head of the Church and those around him; or else that the Pope must be the acknowledged independent sovereign of a distinct territory The first arrangement is not, speculatively speaking, impossible, but it will be inconsistent with the free and effective exercise of the Papal functions unless a number of conditions are fulfilled which will never be observed. In the first place, there must be good faith on the part of the sovereign, and firm honesty of purpose. he must be proof against the strong temptation which will be always upon him to employ for his own aggrandizement the great power that he has in his hand, and excuses for doing so will never be wanting. And it is not enough that the ruler should be honest: he must also have power over his subordinates, and over all his subjects, to secure that they shall faithfully assist him in carrying out his honest purpose. and this power of control is far beyond what is possessed, or is likely to be possessed, by any ruler on the earth. Even if a man of exceptional strength to command were able to impress his will on the whole array of those among whom his authority is shared, from the Cabinet Ministers down to the postmen and police, any one of whom would have great powers of petty annoyance: yet old age would

come and the iron will would fail, and during the dotage of the Ruler, the promised immunity would be gone nor can any assurance be felt that the successor would have the same honesty and strength. The conditions on which the government of the Church depends might fail at any moment, or could be maintained only by a perpetual miracle

Nor is this all It is not enough that the Pope be free, if he be not known to be free. Now, when it is seen that the Pope is in the power of one among the many nations which it belongs to his office to govern, a suspicion will surely arise that his actions towards other nations is in some manner influenced by his connection with that one in the midst of which he resides and this suspicion will be fatal to his influence, which depends wholly upon his moral power During the seventy years (1307—1377) that the Popes resided at Avignon, their authority fell into great contempt, for they were regarded as creatures of the French monarch Also, it is too clear to need mention that he would be wholly unable to rebuke as might be needful the monarch and great men of the place of his abode

For these reasons and others that might be added, we see that the government of the Church cannot be carried on efficiently, unless the Pope is the independent Ruler of a State and we understand with how much reason Pope Pius IX condemned those who think otherwise. He will not allow that they deserve to be called sons of the Catholic Church who argue about the compatibility of temporal and spiritual kingship (Denz

1624), and he condemns the proposition that the abrogation of the temporal power of the Apostolic See would conduce very much to the liberty and happiness of the Church (Denz. 1625), similar passages are found in abundance in the Papal utterances of the last forty years It was therefore the good providence of God over His Church that, immediately after the conversion of the Roman Empire, secured to the Popes the government of an independent territory, and no government in Europe can show a better title than that in virtue of which the Popes exercised their sovereignty for more than fifteen centuries It is true that during the times of persecution they had no temporal power, with the result that, almost to a man, they were murdered by the government that held sway over them but no one will say that in those days the Church had attained her full development and normal state Nor must it be said that a small independent territory, such as the old States of the Church, was useless for securing freedom to the Popes, who were necessarily swayed by the wishes of powerful neighbours Even a small territory secured them from the insidious modes of attack to which the Pope is liable if he rests merely on a guaranteed immunity, whereas any violation of the territory, however small, would have attracted attention, and roused the spirit of all that was Catholic in Europe

The ways of God are unknown to us, but we remember that history tells us of many times when the prospects of the Church seemed no less dark

than they are at present, while the Pontiff is deprived of his freedom of action In 527, Pope John I. died in prison, in exile, in the hands of an enemy who called himself a Christian the same fate befell St Silverius, and in more recent times Pius VI , whose successor Pius VII was, in 1809, carried prisoner into a foreign land, yet very shortly he was restored to his own by the influence of a nation that made no pretence of being his spiritual children

306 *Recapitulation.*—In this chapter we have dealt with a few points, belonging properly to public Canon Law, concerning the relations of the Church with temporal princes. This closes our Treatise on the Roman Pontiff, which may be looked upon as a continuation of the Treatise on the Church The Church under the Roman Pontiff and often speaking by his voice, gives us proximate guidance in matters of faith and morals extracting and applying the teachings contained in the Holy Scripture and the other monuments of Tradition, and thus making known to us the contents of the message brought to each by Jesus Christ our Lord, whose Divine authority we learned in our first Treatise Thus we reach the close of our preliminary matter, and we might proceed at once to the Treatises of Theology properly so called on God, One and Three, and on the action of God in the world But it is usual and convenient, before passing on, to treat shortly a few points concerning the virtue of Faith, a Treatise on which will close this volume

Treatise the Sixth.

Faith.

CHAPTER I.

THE ACT OF FAITH.

307. *Plan of Treatise*—"Without faith it is impossible to please God" (Hebrews xi 6) This declaration of the Apostle teaches us that faith is necessary for man, if he is to attain his end, in a way which it is not true of other virtues or dispositions All forms of Christianity therefore agree in recognizing the supreme importance of faith, but they differ very much, one from another, in the explanations that they give upon the matter We shall in this Treatise try to set forth and justify the Catholic doctrine of faith, so far as is needed to illustrate the relation of individual Christians to the Church. The subject of faith has a place, more or less, in almost every Treatise of Theology, and we have already had occasion to make frequent use of the word, and we shall find ourselves compelled, in the present Treatise, to anticipate much of what will be said in future volumes on God, justification, the Sacraments, and other subjects. The impossi-

bility that we so often meet with, of treating any part of theology alone, apart from other portions, serves to show that dogmatic theology is a single science, and not a mere bundle of detached disquisitions It has been said that each theological Treatise requires to be introduced by Prolegomena, containing the whole of the rest of the science A clear perception of this essential oneness of the subject will lead the reader to exercise patience, and to believe that what seem to be obscurities and omissions will disappear before the end is reached

We shall discuss in three chapters, the nature of an act of faith, its relation to reason, and to the Church

308 *Subject of the Chapter.*—In this chapter we shall consider the meaning borne by the word faith in Holy Scripture, and show that it is what is expressed by the definition given by Catholic divines The conditions of an act of faith will then be shown to be what this definition suggests But first it will be necessary to explain some terms of which we must make use

309 *Explanation of Terms*—There are certain terms connected with our subject, as to which it is of vital importance to have clear notions We shall borrow the explanations of some of these from the work of Father John Rickaby on *The First Principles of Knowledge*, the whole of which, but especially the third and thirteenth chapters of the first part, should be studied by all who wish to obtain a comprehensive view of the subject.

I. *Certitude* is defined to be "the state of the mind when it firmly assents to something, because of motives which exclude at least all solid, reasonable misgivings, though not necessarily all misgivings whatsoever." We assume here that man may have certitude as to some parts of his knowledge, in the sense here defined, and that this knowledge bears a resemblance to the thing known to deny this is that ultra scepticism which renders discussion impossible. The sources of certitude are discussed in the second part of Father Rickaby's work, just quoted.

II *Ignorance* is the state of mind of a person who knows nothing on a subject.

III. *Doubt* "in its widest sense would include all the states intermediate between Ignorance and Certitude." But it may conveniently be narrowed, and confined to those cases where the mind recognizes that there is a question: we may have *Negative Doubt*, where the mind is in a state of equipoise "due to the absence of valid reasons on either side," or *Positive Doubt*, which is "the equipoise of the mind, due to the fact that the reasons on either side are equal and opposite"

IV. *Suspicion* is "so faint an inclination to yield in one direction that not even a probable assent is yielded, but there is a leaning towards a side."

V. *Opinion* is when an assent is given "as to a mere probability". "in the general sense of what from the appearance seems likeliest, or at all events likely." "There is evidently wide room for

variety between the limits of slender and of very substantial probability"

VI. *Probability* is the character of a thing as seen by one who holds an opinion concerning it

VII *Belief* will be understood as having meanings that correspond to the meanings of the verb believe "To believe signifies sometimes (*a*) to hold a thing as a probable opinion: and sometimes (*b*) to hold it as "certain, whether (*a*) generally, without specially distinguishing the nature of the grounds or (*β*) specially on the ground of the testimony of witnesses, or (*γ*) again specially, in cases where the object is not immediately presented to the perceptive faculties, *e g.*, belief in a fact as remembered" We shall commonly employ the word *bβ*.

VIII *Evidence* is "that character or quality about proposed truths or propositions, whereby they make themselves accepted by the intellect, or win assent; while the intellect is made conscious that such assents are not mere subjective phenomena of its own, but concern facts and principles which have a validity independent of its perception of them . . . "Evidence is not a proposition at all, but a character of all propositions which so come before the mind as rightly and for their own sake to demand its assent." Truths or propositions that have this character or quality are said to be *Evident* Error being a non-entity can never demand the assent of the mind, or be evident, in the sense explained, that is, there cannot be real evidence of that which is not true it can only be through hastiness of judgment, culpable or inculpable, that

Probability, however high, is mistaken for *Evidence*. It is scarcely worth while to remark that the word *Evidence*, as here used, has none but a remote connection with the popular, forensic use of the word, as when we say of a lawsuit, that conflicting evidence is adduced by the parties. "Evidence" such as this is very far from making the thing "evident"

IX *Credible* is said of an object of *Belief*, in all the senses of that word. We shall call a thing credible when it is held as certain on the testimony of witnesses. It may be evident that a thing is credible, although the thing itself is far from evident

We take the next definition from the *Moral Philosophy* of Father Joseph Rickaby.

X. "*A Habit* is a quality difficult to change, whereby an agent whose nature it was to work one way or another, indeterminately, is disposed easily and readily, at will, to follow this or that particular line of action *Habit* differs from *Disposition*, as *Disposition* is a quality easily changed. . Again, *Habit* differs from *Faculty* or *Power* as *Power* enables one to act, but *Habit*, presupposing *Power*, renders action easy and expeditious, and reliable to come at call"

XI *Natural* and *Infused Habits* are distinct in origin, and to some extent in result Naturally, a habit is the result of acts, and is said to be *Acquired* These primitive acts were done "with difficulty, fitfully, and with many failures," but when they had engendered the habit, they were done "readily, reliably, and artistically." Repeated acts, then, have a natural power of working some change in

the man, which is seen in its effects, but the intrinsic nature of which it belongs to Psychology to discuss The primitive acts engender the natural habit by way of second causes, and God, the First Cause, can, if He pleases, do by His direct action whatever He ordinarily does through second causes He can, therefore, produce a *habit* in a man, even when the man has not performed any primitive acts and such a habit would be said to be *infused* It is to be observed that according to most theologians—Valentia is an exception—the infused habits make the corresponding acts possible, but do not render them easy. This is all that we need to say at present it belongs to the Treatise on Justification to show that the concession of such *Infused Habits* is a part of the ordinary supernatural providence of God We shall see when we treat of grace that the presence of an infused habit is neither necessary nor sufficient to render possible a supernatural act

XII *Grace* is the subject of one of the principal Treatises of Theology. It is enough for our present purpose to say that by *Grace* we mean an influence not required by man's nature, but gratuitously bestowed upon man by God, without which he would be unable to attain the supernatural end for which he is destined which influence gives light to the intellect and strength to the will, to help it to perform an act which is good in itself, and at the same time to raise this act above its natural value and make it such as to help the doer towards his supernatural end.

310. *"Faith" in Scripture.*—The English word faith, representing almost invariably the Greek πίστις and the Latin *Fides*, occurs very frequently in the New Testament: the adjective "faithful" represents the Greek πιστός and the Latin *fidelis*, while the English uses "believe" and the Latin *credo*, for the corresponding Greek verb, πιστεύω. The constancy of this usage is remarkable, especially as it extends to such negative forms as "unbeliever," "faithless," &c.; and it is further most remarkable that, putting aside some stray exceptions which are easily shown to be apparent only, the meaning conveyed by these words is everywhere the same, and is a meaning not difficult of apprehension; it is what we have explained as the leading meaning of "belief" (n. 309, VII. *b* β.) Faith is represented in Scripture as being an act of the intellect, in saying which we by no means say that the influence of the will is excluded, but merely that the act of faith is completed in the intellect. This follows from the very idea of faith which, as opposed to sight, signifies belief on the testimony of another; and when this other is God, we have Divine faith, with which alone we are concerned: and thus we have the definition of faith given by the Vatican Council (Sess. 3, cap. 3; Denz. 1638): "Faith is a supernatural virtue, through which by the influence and with the aid of the grace of God we believe that the things which He has revealed are true, not because of their intrinsic truth seen by natural light, but on the authority of God Himself, who has given the revelation, who cannot be deceived nor deceive." That

faith is thus opposed to sight is seen plainly in such passages as the words of Christ to St Thomas the Apostle, on the blessedness of them that have not seen and have believed (St John xx 29), and that it is in the intellect follows from the second half of the verse the opening words of which we quoted at the beginning of this chapter. *He that cometh to* God must believe that He is, and is a rewarder to them that seek Him (Hebrews xi. 6.) It is a work of the intellect to believe that God is. None other was the faith of Abraham, which was reputed to him unto justice (Genesis xv 6), and which is so extolled by St Paul (Romans iv.) he believed on the authority of God, who made the revelation, that his seed should be as the number of the stars and another passage from the same Epistle (x. 9) is very clear If thou confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in thy heart that God hath raised Him up from the dead, thou shalt be saved Such was the word of faith which St. Paul preached the person addressed had not seen the risen Lord, but if he believed the word of the preacher as a messenger from God, it would be well with him This sense will be found to be applicable in all places of Holy Scripture, except in some stray instances as where the words in question (*πιστεύω, credo*) are plainly to be translated "committed," or the like (1 Cor ix 17)

311 *Erroneous Views*—A great variety of erroneous meanings have been attached to the word "faith," and this sometimes by Catholic writers, especially of early times. Thus, assent to first

principles has sometimes been called faith, as has all mediate knowledge of a cause from its effect, also, all firm conviction, especially on religious matters, or approval of certain religious views. Many confound faith with opinion, ascribing to belief the first meaning that we gave (n 309, VII. *a*), and many again confound it with confidence, in which sense it is very frequently used by Protestants, especially in connection with their doctrine on Justification.

It is perfectly true that the word "faith" is often used in Scripture where it would seem that we might substitute "confidence," as in the case of the praise addressed by our Lord to the Syrophenician woman (St. Matt. xv 28), "O woman, great is thy faith," where the point might seem to be that her persistence showed great confidence in the power and goodness of Him to whom she made her prayer But this confidence was nothing but the outcome of her belief that He was good and powerful, a truth which He had revealed to her by His words and works, together with the interior working of His grace, and so the text gives no new sense to the word "faith," and many other texts are susceptible of the same explanation. but the meaning "confidence" is wholly out of place in such passages as we have quoted from Genesis, St John, and St Paul

St Paul has given us (Hebrews xi 1) an inspired definition of Faith. Faith is the substance of things to be hoped for, the evidence of things that appear not St Thomas (*Summa*, 2 2 q. 4 a. 1.) shows by a course of subtle reasoning that this definition

includes all that is essential in faith, and that all other definitions are mere expansions of this text Thus, he remarks, that the word translated "evidence" excludes all doubt, though we must remember that the word is not here used in the sense which we have explained (n 309, VIII.). the Greek ἔλεγχος and the Latin *argumentum* would perhaps be better represented by "conclusive proof" Faith is concerned with "things not seen," differing herein from sight that it deals with "things to be hoped for" shows that the Apostle has in mind Divine faith, which help us to eternal beatitude

312. *Analysis of Faith*—In Faith, we must distinguish the material object, or thing that we believe, *e g*, the Trinity of Persons in God, from the formal object, or reason why we believe it · in this case, because God has revealed it. If the formal motive of our assent be the evidence, immediate or mediate, we have knowledge or sight, and not faith There is a controversy whether there can be Faith and Sight concerning the same object, in other words whether we can believe a thing both because we are told it on good authority and because we see it to be true St Thomas, Scotus, and others hold that when a thing is seen, the adhesion of the mind receives no strengthening from the authority of one who states that it is so, but the commoner opinion is that of Lugo, who holds that there may be Sight which does not satisfy all the requirement of the mind, and that authority may find a place, to complete its satisfaction.

In order that a man may have faith, besides the knowledge that God can neither deceive nor be deceived, he must have certitude that God has spoken and this certitude is given by the what are called the motives of credibility, the existence of which man can know with certitude. Several points of this statement need development.

The authority of God is plainly presupposed in every act of faith, and we need not base the act on any assertion of the Divine veracity conveyed along with the revelation; for this supposition at once raises the question why we are to believe this assertion Faith would not be reasonable if it rested on such an assertion which by supposition is unsupported. (1 St Peter iii. 15) The reader must be warned that what is here said, although a common view, is not universally accepted by theologians It is the teaching of Lugo, Franzelin, and many others, who argue at length in support of their view, on the ground of the vicious circle which they find in the opposing explanation given by Viva and many others, following Suarez. They remark further that if the thing revealed is believed simply because it is revealed, then it cannot properly be said to be believed on the authority of Him that gives the revelation. And our faith is to be a reasonable service, the work of our reason, aided by grace, and it will not be so unless we see that we have sufficient motives for yielding our assent This account of the famous controversy must suffice for the present (See further n 302.)

That we must have certitude, and not mere

opinion, that God has spoken, follows from this that without it we could not have certitude regarding the material object of the act: we should be in doubt, which is inconsistent with faith, in the Scriptural sense. (Acts viii 37; St James i. 6) And this is why the following proposition was condemned by Pope Innocent XI. (Prop 21, Denz 1038) "A supernatural assent of faith, profitable for salvation, is consistent with a merely probable knowledge of revelation, and even with a misgiving that perhaps God has not spoken" The motives of credibility which give this certitude are those contained in our first Treatise (see nn 74, 75), where we showed that the miracles of Christ, the prophecies, and other topics proved evidently that the Divine origin of the Christian Revelation was credible. If it is thought that the Divine origin of a revelation is to be gathered from the sublimity of the matter revealed, then we no longer have faith, but sight The Vatican Council (Sess 3, Can 4, *De Fide*, Denz 1660) defines that miracles may sometimes be known, and that they prove the Divine origin of the Christian religion It must of course always be kept in mind that these miracles and other proofs do no more than dispose men to faith, and render the fact of the revelation certain they do not constitute the formal object of faith, which is none other than the authority of God It will be observed that our doctrine leaves an important function to reason, even in a question of faith The relation of the two forms the subject of our next chapter

313. *The Certitude of Revelation.*—We must now consider more in particular what that certitude of the fact of Revelation must be, without which no act of faith is possible. And first it is clear that there is no need that the whole mass of motives of credibility should be present to the mind, for if this were so, no man could ever make an act of faith, or attain salvation. Nor, on the other hand, must the motives of credibility be so overwhelming as to make the fact of Revelation evident, for then the act of faith would no longer be free and meritorious: the devils believe and tremble (St. James ii. 19), but the fact of Revelation is to them evident, and they have no merit in their faith, which in truth is something different from the faith of which men are capable. It follows, as we have said (n 75), that such motives are necessary and sufficient as make the fact of Revelation evidently credible.

It will be observed that no act of faith can be made in the presence of our Lord in any particular Host. We have certitude that the doctrine of the Real Presence in every duly consecrated Host is divinely revealed, for this is a part of the Catholic faith, proposed by the infallible Church (nn 205, 327), but we cannot have certitude concerning any one Host, that it is duly consecrated, for there may have been some fatal defect in the rite. We can, however, adore every Host which we prudently judge to be consecrated, because the act of adoration does not require certitude as to the character of the object, provided we have probability and there is no peril of idolatry, for an act of this sort

must be judged according to the intention with which it is done, and no one intends to adore a Host absolutely, but only on the supposition that it is consecrated In the same way we may give an alms to an impostor whom we prudently believe to be a deserving person By this conduct we have in fact given encouragement to wickedness, but it is nevertheless laudable as an act of charity to our neighbour A difficulty that may be felt on this matter has been anticipated. (n 192, VIII)

The nature and weight of these motives will vary infinitely with the variety of ability and attainments of each man Whatever the man sees to be enough to remove prudent misgiving from his mind is enough for him We saw (n 309, VIII) that this state of mind can never go along with falsehood, the truth of the thing may show itself to different persons in very different forms, but falsehood can never show itself at all. It is to be observed that children and rude and uninstructed persons, if they have little power to understand and weigh motives of credibility, have on the other hand little tendency to entertain doubts, as is shown by every day's experience The tendency of a child's mind is to believe everything which is told to him by his parents, or other persons whom he trusts, hence, if they tell him that there is a God who rewards them that seek Him (Hebrews xi 6), he believes them without misgiving, and makes a saving act of faith in the revelation which has been thus made known to him, if they go on to tell him that the Pope is the enemy of God, he still probably

fails to recognize any ground for misgiving, and so believes as before, but he is mistaken, however blamelessly, and if he had considered the matter more attentively, he would have seen ground of misgiving, and as time goes on he will perhaps recognize it, if not, he will come to his death still holding the truth and the error, and will attain salvation by his faith in spite of the misfortune under which he has been labouring

What is here said of motives of credibility may happen in other matters Thus, a boy may solve two questions in arithmetic. he deals with the one correctly and obtains the correct result, in the other he blunders, and his answer is wrong He feels the same assurance about both, he is not conscious of having taken more care with one than the other, yet the fact that one is right and the other wrong remains, and is entirely independent of his assurance on the subject But there is a great difference in the cases of the two sums In the first case, no amount of diligence will detect any flaw in the working, for the simple reason that there is no flaw, in the other, there is a flaw which may be detected if sufficient diligence be used Also, we may remark that a mistake in arithmetic, however little culpable, may be financially disastrous, and in the same way, an inculpable mistake in the search for revealed truth, though not sinful in itself, may involve grave spiritual loss

What is here said of children is true of the rude and simple of all ages, and in fact, it may perhaps be said to be true, in a measure, with all mankind

Those who deal much with the young and uneducated, often observe that the truths of faith sink into their minds and seem to find a place there, whereas they are troubled and tend to reject the teaching, if any error in faith chances to be set before them

All this is curiously illustrated by the history of conversions to the faith, the reasons that one person assigns as having led him into the Church often seeming strangely insufficient in the eyes of his fellows. Much, no doubt, depends upon the measure of illuminating and exciting grace which is given to each person (n 318), the distribution of which is known to God alone, much also upon the presence or absence of the infused habit of faith (n 309, XI.) which, as we shall show hereafter, is given to all men who are justified and is not lost unless and until they commit some sin which is expressly opposed to the virtue of faith.

The Vatican Council tells us that God by His grace stirs up them that are in error, and helps them that they may come to the truth, and that in the case of such as have already passed from darkness into His marvellous light, He strengthens them that they may persevere, not deserting them unless He first be deserted

314 *Faith and Moral Virtues*—It is worth while to say something more on the difference between Faith and the Moral Virtues, to clear up the difficulty which is sometimes felt as to why certainty is required for Faith, while Probability suffices in other cases to make an act meritorious The

subject has already been touched on. (n 313) One difference between the two cases is found in the unchangeable nature of Faith, for what we have once believed we can never be at liberty to deny, whereas he who has once given an alms to a particular person is no way obliged to make the same person the object of a second bounty Also, Faith puts him that believes under burdensome obligations, which is not ordinarily the case with the other virtues; if the case accidentally occur that an act of almsgiving would be specially burdensome, nothing short of certainty can make it obligatory It is seldom that we can have certainty as to the deserving character of one who is to be the object of our bounty, and so, were certainty necessary, this form of virtue would seldom be possible, probability is enough to make our act a laudable recognition of the claims of charity, whereas adhesion to error can never laudably take the place of adhesion to truth, although it may sometimes be laudable as showing humility or other moral virtue. But the chief difference is found in the exclusion of all misgiving which is necessary for Faith, as already explained (n 312, and see Viva's commentary on the condemned proposition there quoted)

315 *Faith in God*—Of the wisdom of our Lord there is no number (Psalm cxlvi 5) He that sent Christ is true (St John viii 26) It is impossible for God to lie (Hebrews vi 18) In these texts we have a clear revelation of the Divine veracity, which is therefore a part of the material object of faith But according to the doctrine of

Lugo which we follow (n 312), this same veracity is presupposed in every act of faith, and a difficulty may be felt as to how we can assent to a proposition on a ground which presupposes the truth of that proposition But it is to be observed that, as already remarked (n 312), the same truth may be the object both of faith and of sight, our acceptance of it may rest on two distinct grounds, so that in the case before us we may believe in the Divine veracity, both because our reason teaches us that God is veracious, and because the veracious God has revealed the doctrine to us And this last assent is a true act of Divine faith, or submission to the authority of God, and therefore lacks nothing of the characters that render other acts of Divine faith laudable

316 *Faith Obligatory and Free*—Every person to whom the fact of revelation becomes known is bound to believe the truth revealed, for by supposition, it is evident to him that he can prudently accept the truth of the revelation, and to refuse to do so is an insult to Him that gave it, besides which, the revelation teaches that without faith, salvation is impossible (Hebrews xi 6), so that he who refuses to make the act of faith which he sees to be prudently possible, sins by refusing to do what is necessary for his salvation

That faith is free scarcely needs to be demonstrated, so clear is the teaching of Scripture and experience on the subject There is a common saying that none are so blind as those who *will* not see, which attests the conviction of men that belief

depends to some extent upon the free-will And it is in accordance with this that we find in Scripture that faith is praised (Romans iv 3), and rewarded (Romans x 9), while the want of it is blamed (St. Luke ix 41), and punished (St Mark xvi 16) All this implies that faith is free, and the root of this freedom is found, as already explained (n 75), in the power of the will to turn the attention towards or away from considerations which the evidence afforded by the motives of credibility has shown to be mere trifles, such as ought not to weigh with a prudent man

No one who has once seen that the Christian Revelation, or any part of it, is evidently credible, can ever have good reason for reconsidering the question, on pretence, for example, of suspending assent until the matter is made clear to them on intrinsic grounds, it is evident to him that his doubt is unreasonable This is taught by the Vatican Council (Sess 3, cap 3, and Can 6, *De Fide*, Denz 1642, 1662), and Pope Innocent XI had long before condemned the proposition (Prop. 20, Denz 1037; see Viva on this and the kindred proposition) that a man may sometimes prudently withdraw a supernatural assent which he has once given Whenever any one who held any part of Christian faith abandons it, we know that there has been sin

317 *Doubts as to Faith* —This will be the place to point out the difference between the cases of a Catholic and of one who is not a Catholic, when doubts occur to them regarding their religious belief

When this happens, the Catholic is not at liberty to suspend his belief, even provisionally, while one who is not a Catholic is not only at liberty to institute an inquiry, but may be bound to do so, and even to embrace a new doctrine. The reason of this difference is that the truth will always be seen more clearly, the more diligently it is investigated, especially when we speak of the truth concerning the revelation which has been granted by God to men, and which is the necessary means of their salvation, but error will never seem more acceptable when subjected to closer honest inquiry. He, therefore, who has once been a Catholic, and who has had the absolute certainty of the truth of Catholic faith as a Divine revelation, must be convinced beforehand that an inquiry pursued with suspended faith cannot possibly lead him to truth, but if, retaining his assent, he humbly, faithfully, and prayerfully seek a solution of his doubt he will attain it, for God will not refuse him the light he needs and asks for One who is not a Catholic has not got, and cannot have, the same certainty (n 313), for error in religion cannot be evidently credible; and when doubt occurs to him, and he pursues it, he will discover that the certainty which he imagined that he had was no true certainty, for it was no more than an opinion which he had mistaken for certainty, and this whether his mistake had been culpable or inculpable. It may happen that a man is outside the Church, and in error in his religious faith, and that no doubt ever occurs to him, or he may conceive a doubt, but on inquiry

see what he deems to be prudent reasons to put it aside. In these cases he remains blamelessly in his error (see n 184)

318 *The Need of Grace*—It is the doctrine of the Catholic Church, to be fully discussed in the Treatise on the subject, that no salutary act can be done by man without the assistance of that supernatural illumination and inspiration of the Holy Spirit which is called grace One effect of this grace is to assist the weakness of man, giving further light to his intellect and strength to his will, beyond their natural strength, but another effect is to raise the act to a dignity of which it would otherwise be devoid, and to which no act of any pure creature can attain without Divine help this dignity being what is needed to make the act conducive to the attainment of the altogether supernatural end for which man in fact is destined A branch of this general doctrine is taught by the Vatican Council in the third Session (cap 3, *De Fide*, and Can 5), where those are condemned who assert that grace is not necessary for an act of faith, unless it be that living faith which acts through charity. An act of faith, conducive to salvation, may be made both by one who is of the number of the just (n. 184) and by a sinner but in neither case can it be made without the aid of Divine, supernatural grace When we come to discuss the distribution of grace we shall see that all men always receive, either proximately or remotely, the grace that is necessary to enable them to attain their end.

We see the necessity of grace for a salutary act of faith when we consider how strong is the natural disinclination of men to render obedience, and to make an act of faith is to humble ourselves to obey We must assent to the truths proposed absolutely, not looking to the internal reasons that may recommend them, but solely on account of the authority on which they come, and this, even though we may seem to see internal difficulties in the matter proposed Further, one who accepts the revelation given by God, acknowledges at the same time that he is bound to submit to the law of God and of the Church, and this submission not only affects his whole life in every-day matters, but not unfrequently involves his enduring grave inconvenience rather than violate his duty In this way we see how peculiarly necessary is the grace of God to help those who are called upon to embrace the true faith in their riper years and we remember that prayer is the ordinary means of securing all necessary grace

So far we have spoken chiefly of the need of the grace that enlightens and strengthens, there is no need to enlarge in this place upon that other effect of grace which is absolutely necessary for every salutary act

319 *The Certainty of Faith* —The nature of an act of faith will be further illustrated if we consider its certainty Among the propositions condemned by Pope Innocent XIII, the nineteenth runs as follows "The will is unable to cause the assent of faith to be in itself more firm than is due to the

weight of the reasons that impel to the assent" (Denz 1036) We see how this condemnation is just if we consider that the motives of credibility are not the formal object of faith (n 312), these motives convince the reason that God has spoken, and then the will commands the intellect to assent on the authority of God who has given the revelation This authority is the highest possible motive for believing, and therefore affords grounds for the firmest possible assent and this firmness is not proportioned to the motives of credibility, which are merely a previous condition A man visits a place which he learns on undoubted authority to be the scene of some stirring historical event his emotions depend on the character of the event, and are no way proportioned to the character of the source of his information as to the site.

As truth cannot contradict truth (n 322), no question can really arise as to whether we are ready to adhere to the truths of faith even in opposition to naturally certain knowledge But subject to this remark, it is beyond doubt that the dignity of the formal object of faith, namely the authority of God, outweighs the dignity of the formal object of all possible natural knowledge, and commands a higher degree of firmness of adhesion And this doctrine is quite consistent with the teaching of St Thomas (*Summ Theol* 2 2 q 4 a 8 corp), that if certainty be considered on the side of the subject, natural knowledge, which is more fully grasped by the intellect, is more certain than that which the intellect is incapable of grasping,

but this accidental difference does not hinder the simple assertion that faith is in itself more certain than knowledge

In all this matter, it is most important to avoid being led to entertain questions which are founded on absurd suppositions

320 *Recapitulation* —Much more might be said on the nature of faith, but this much must suffice at present the matter will recur more than once In this chapter, which should be read in connection with the seventh and last chapter of our First Treatise on the Christian Revelation, we have explained the meaning of certain important words, and shown the sense which the word Faith bears in Scripture, which is Belief on the authority of God. The nature of faith is then analyzed, and the grounds of its certainty are explained, especially in the case of the young and the simple after which it is shown that faith is at once obligatory and free that grace is needed for a salutary act of faith, and that faith is more certain than all natural knowledge.

CHAPTER II.

REVELATION AND REASON.

321. *Subject of the Chapter*.—This short chapter will show, by way of comment upon certain definitions of the Vatican Council, that Revelation and Reason, far from being opposed to each other, afford mutual support.

322. *Oneness of Truth*.—In the third chapter of the Third Session of the Vatican Council, which we have already frequently quoted, we find the following: "Although Faith be above Reason, yet between Faith and Reason no true opposition is possible, for the same God as reveals mysteries and infuses Faith, has furnished the mind of man with the light of reason, and God cannot deny Himself, nor can Truth ever contradict Truth An empty semblance of contradiction arises either from the doctrines of Faith not having been understood and explained according to the mind of the Church, or from fanciful opinions being taken for the voice of Reason."

This is too clear to need explanation By way of illustration we may point out that, granting geology has established that the work of creation of the world was not accomplished in six natural days, yet this is not against the Catholic faith, for

the same doctrine was held by St Augustine, fifteen centuries ago (*De Genesi ad Lit* 4, 34, 53; *P.L* 34, 319) On the other hand, the Manichean fancy of two principles which long captivated a large part of civilized mankind, was really opposed to the faith of the Church, and now finds no one to support it.

323 *Faith in Mysteries*—The same Council teaches, in the following chapter, the following doctrine "Reason enlightened by Faith, by its diligent, reverent, and sober research, obtains from God some most fruitful understanding of mysteries, from their analogy with natural knowledge, and from their connection one with another and with the last end of man, but it never arrives at seeing them as it sees the truths which are its proper object For the mysteries of God by their very nature so surpass the powers of the created intellect that even when they have been revealed and accepted by faith, they nevertheless remain covered by the veil of faith and enveloped in darkness, so long as in this mortal life, being in the body we are absent from the Lord, for we walk by faith and not by sight" The same is expressed more shortly in the First Canon on Faith and Reason· "If any one say that Divine revelation contains nothing that is truly and properly called mystery, but that all the doctrines of faith may be understood and demonstrated from natural principles if the Reason be properly exercised, let him be Anathema"

All this must be admitted, unless any one would say that the human mind is capable by its own powers of arriving at all truth, which can never

be proved. In fact, all men habitually guide their conduct by their faith in mysteries, which neither they nor their fellows understand. No prudent doubt is possible that messages are sent by the electric telegraph across the Atlantic, yet very few men know this of their own knowledge, they believe it on the authority of others, which makes it evidently credible to them, and their faith is no way disturbed by knowing that no man on earth professes to understand how the message is sent, what goes on in the submarine cable is a mystery to all men, at least for the present

Teachers of physical science sometimes indulge in a vain boast that their pupils are expected and encouraged to believe nothing that they do not see, and sometimes they will claim for their subject a peculiar degree of certainty on this ground, tacitly, or perhaps openly, contrasting their teaching with the teaching of Christian preachers, who avow that they call upon their hearers to believe what is told them on the authority of another How vain is this boast will be seen by an example A lecturer on chemistry tells his class that water is formed by the combination of oxygen and hydrogen in certain proportions, and he performs an experiment which, under a large number of reserves, may be allowed to suggest that what he says is true, but which certainly does no more A member of the class then repeats the experiment for himself, and declares that he obtains a different result How will he be treated? He will most surely be told authoritatively that he has blundered, that the

experiment has been performed thousands of times by the most skilful manipulators, and so on, in short, he will be told that the lecturer's account is evidently credible, and that he must exercise the virtue of faith, under pain of being considered and treated as wilfully obstinate.

Faith assists reason by supplying it with a certain number of safe points of departure, which are useful in its study of natural knowledge, while Reason assists Faith by its investigation of the motives of credibility, and by discovering analogies existing between the various parts of Revelation and of natural knowledge, and it clears up all cases of apparent conflict between the truths of Revelation and other certain truths The development of all this will be found in the Encyclical on the subject issued by Pope Leo XIII, and beginning with the words, *Æterni Patris*

324 *Recapitulation*.—This chapter has shown the error of those who represent Faith and Reason as being in opposition, instead of working harmoniously, each in its own sphere.

CHAPTER III.

THE RULE OF FAITH.

325. *Subject of the Chapter* —In this chapter we shall consider the different modes in which the contents of the Christian Revelation and kindred matters may become known to us, and the different obligations which the knowledge puts us under.

326 *The Material object of Faith* —So far we have been speaking of the formal object of Faith, or the authority of God who has given the Revelation We now come to consider the material object (n. 312), or that which we believe We are taught by the Vatican Council (Sess 3, cap. 3, *De Fide*) that all things must be believed with *Divine* and *Catholic* faith which are contained in the Word of God, whether written or handed down by tradition, and which have been proposed by the Church to be believed, whether by a solemn judgment, or by her ordinary and universal teaching. (Denz. 1641) It will be observed that this decree recognizes a distinction between *Divine* faith and *Catholic* faith, and we hear also of *ecclesiastical* faith Thus the distinction is important and easily understood, although the names used are perhaps not very apt to signify it. That which God has revealed may be believed with *Divine* faith; if further, the Church

has proposed it for belief as part of the Divine Revelation, it may be believed with *Divine* and *Catholic* faith, or more shortly, with *Catholic* faith If the matter is proposed by the Church for belief, not as being revealed, but nevertheless as coming within the scope of her Infallibility, such as a dogmatic fact (n 211), it is the object of *ecclesiastical* faith To refuse belief to what is a matter of *Divine* and *Catholic* faith is the sin of heresy, refusal of belief to what is of *Divine* but not of *Catholic* faith, or to what is merely of *ecclesiastical* faith, is sinful, but the sin is not heresy.

Nothing can be the object of Catholic faith that is not contained, and declared by the Church as being contained, in the public Revelation given to the Church (nn 22, 23) Such parts of this public Revelation as are not defined, but become known with certitude to any person may be believed by him with Divine faith, as may happen to a theologian who has studied the monuments of tradition and sees that it contains some doctrine which the Church has not yet defined in any manner. Similarly, Divine faith is due to a private Revelation from God, if such a Revelation come to be known with certitude by any person, which is possible perhaps, but happens very rarely, if at all At the same time it would be rash and presumptuous of any one to speak or think contemptuously of all such Revelations, especially of such as are widely received among the faithful and are circulated with the sanction, express or tacit, of the Church, this sanction assures us that they contain nothing

opposed to the Catholic faith and that they may be studied with profit, but assures us of nothing more.

Revelation may be formal, when the thing is expressly or impliedly declared by God, or virtual, when it can be inferred by necessary consequence from what is revealed What is revealed in either mode may be proposed by the Church for belief, and become the object of Catholic faith

327. *Proposal by the Church* —There are certain modes employed by the Church for infallibly declaring to the faithful the contents of the public revelation that she has received, which are reserved for occasional use, on extraordinary occasions These modes include the definitions of Ecumenical Councils, whether they are couched in the form of short "canons" alone, or of fuller "chapters," such as were used at Trent and at the Vatican, and which have no less authority than the canons, so far as it appears that the Council meant them to be received as a declaration of the faith They include also professions of faith or creeds, put forth by authority, to which may be likened the tests which have been proposed from time to time to persons who have come under suspicion of heresy, whether in the form of questions to be answered by them (Denz 551—583), or propositions to be subscribed (Denz 1488—1493) Here also come ex-cathedral definitions of the Roman Pontiff (n 290), and such doctrinal decrees of local Councils (n 296) as have been solemnly approved by the Pope and received by the whole Church.

But besides these extraordinary modes of manifesting her mind, the Church also speaks by way of ordinary teaching, and this teaching is found in the preaching of her ministers, whether formally ordained for this work or not (n. 203), and it is found also, and very specially, in the teaching conveyed by her liturgy and ritual (n 95.) It will be observed that the Vatican definition which we have quoted in the preceding number recognizes these two modes of infallible teaching

Doctrines are sometimes said to be Catholic of which no one would maintain that they form part of the Catholic faith, in the sense explained. These are such as are held by recognized schools of theology, without rebuke, although they have not been adopted by the Church, either by the extraordinary or the ordinary exertion of her authority they may even be such that the contradictory has an equal right to be called Catholic, and the word is in these cases used in a negative sense, merely meaning that the doctrine in question is not opposed to the Catholic faith. The parties to these controversies are prepared to submit, if ever the Church declare where the truth lies otherwise, they would forfeit the right to the name of Catholic by their heresy in denying the infallible authority of the Church. (See n 220)

328 *Censures* —The Church often teaches by way of censuring certain theological propositions, and we have had frequent occasion to refer to such condemnations Censures of this sort must not be confounded with personal censures, such as excom-

munication and suspension, which are spiritual punishments inflicted upon delinquents by the ecclesiastical courts. (n. 196) It is even said that the Church may forbid the teaching of a certain proposition under pain of excommunication, without at the same time declaring that the proposition is false The terms of censure attached to condemned propositions are various and are not always sharply distinguished: their different shades of meaning are best learned by the study of the Bull *Auctorem Fidei* (n 182, Denz 1363—1461), which stigmatizes a variety of propositions separately, and with great attention to propriety of language The authority of the condemnation depends upon the source from which it comes, and the intention with which it is issued.

The following are some of the commonest censures, but many others are in use No less than sixty-nine are enumerated by Montague in his work *De Censuris*, which will be found in Migne's *Cursus Theologicus* (1 1111)

I. Heretical, of what is directly and immediately opposed to the Catholic faith

II. Proximate to heresy, if this opposition is not certain; especially when theologians agree that a doctrine is contained in Divine Revelation, but it has not yet been defined by the Church

III Smacking or suspected of heresy, when the proposition admits of two senses, one of which is heretical, and it seems that this is the sense which it is intended to convey

IV. Rash, if opposed without solid ground to an

opinion commonly held in the Church, or if it be a theological assertion put forward without plausible reason

V Erroneous, if opposed to what is revealed, not immediately, but mediately, by way of conclusion, when one premiss only is revealed

If a proposition is condemned by the infallible authority as heretical, this is equivalent to a definition of the contradictory as an article of the Catholic faith, and such condemnations are frequently appealed to by theologians as decisive The infallibility of the Church may be exercised in passing the other censures, for the meaning of a form of words is a dogmatic fact (n 211), but these lesser condemnations, though they prove the falsity of the proposition, do not amount to a definition of the contradictory Condemnations which do not come from the seat of infallibility are not infallible, and do not command an absolute internal assent, but they are to be received with at least external respect, and with an inclination towards submission of mind, greater or less according to circumstances, and especially to the official position held in the Church by the person or body whose judgment they express What is here said of censures applies to all doctrinal decisions This respect will be greatest when the utterance comes from the Supreme Pontiff himself, who often addresses the whole Church by Encyclicals or otherwise, without the intention which would make the document ex-cathedral (n 290) Great respect is also due to the doctrinal declarations of the Roman Congregations (n 268),

who besides the legislative authority which they receive from the Pontiff, can scarcely be supposed to issue false declarations on matters of faith but it is to be observed that these Congregations do not speak with an infallible voice, for the gift of infallibility belongs to the Pontiff alone, and cannot be communicated by him to another. He often adopts decrees of Congregations and makes them his own, in which case they may have infallible authority if such be the intention of the Pope; and this is in fact one of the commonest ways in which the Pontiff exercises his office of Doctor of the Universal Church.

329 *Recapitulation* —In this chapter we have explained the exact meaning of the phrase "Catholic Faith" and kindred matters, and have shown in what modes the infallible teaching authority of the Church and the Roman Pontiff is exercised.

330. *Close of the Volume.*—With this Treatise we bring the present volume to a close. We may say that its general purpose has been to show what is meant by being a Catholic: next in order would come Treatises on God, One and Three, on the Creation, the Incarnation, and kindred subjects: the course would be closed by Treatises on Grace, the Sacraments, and the Four Last Things In such a course many interesting and important topics are necessarily omitted, but at least an outline, however imperfect, is given of the whole subject of Dogmatic Theology.

APPENDIX.

METHOD OF DISPUTATION.

THE reader may be interested to see a sketch of the mode employed in many Catholic Seminaries to test the work of the classes in Philosophy and Theology.

A few days' notice is given of the date and matter of the disputation A Thesis is selected embodying some point which has been recently treated by the Professor, and one student is assigned to defend this thesis, while one or more others are assigned to object. We shall call the Defendant *D.* and the Objicient *O.* All the proceedings are conducted in Latin.

When the time comes, *D.* reads the Thesis, and shortly explains its meaning, bearing, and grounds, but usually without noticing the objections that may be made against it. This is the business of *O*, who has selected two or three that seem to him most telling among such as he can invent or find by diligent search in the books of authors who have written on either side of the controversy. When *D.* pauses, *O.* reads the Thesis, and formally denies it, *D.* asserts its truth, and thereupon *O.* makes his attack This takes the form of a syllogism, having for its conclusion the contradictory of the

Thesis. *D* repeats the syllogism, to show that he has gathered the words correctly, and then gives his answer to each premiss, granting, denying, or distinguishing as he sees fit. *O.* then undertakes to prove something which *D* has denied, and does so by another syllogism, to which *D* replies as before, and so the dispute goes on, until either the assigned time is exhausted, or *O.* finds it well to abandon his first difficulty and start a new one, or, as sometimes happens, *D.* is reduced to silence

A disputation on St Paul's dealings with St. Peter at Antioch (n. 278) might run something as follows

O. Against the Thesis, "The dispute between St. Paul and Cephas recorded in the second chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians, far from disproving the Primacy and Infallibility of St. Peter, tends to support both," I argue The passage before us shows that St Peter was neither infallible nor Primate therefore, the Thesis is false.

D (After repeating what has been said), *I deny* both parts of the Antecedent

O. I prove the Antecedent, and first as to the first part

That passage shows that St Peter was not infallible which represents him as failing But this passage represents him as failing therefore, &c.

D. I distinguish the Major. Failing in prudence or other virtue, except Faith, *I deny*, failing in Faith, *I sub-distinguish*, and abstaining from teaching falsehood, *I deny*, and teaching falsehood, *I grant I counter-distinguish the Minor* In prudence or other virtue except Faith, or in Faith and abstaining from

teaching error, *I pass it over;* Failing in Faith and teaching error, *I deny*

O But it represents him as teaching error in faith, and I prove it.

St Peter is represented as teaching error in faith, when his conduct is described as leading many to a false belief · But the conduct of St Peter, &c. Therefore, &c

D I distinguish the Major · Leading and intended to lead, *I grant the Major*, leading, contrary to his intention and through the hastiness of those that were led, *I deny I counter-distinguish the Minor*. Leading and intended to lead, *I deny*, otherwise, *I grant.*

O. But they were not led away through hastiness, and I prove it.

It is not hasty to suppose that a Pope will act according to his convictions But those whom Peter led away merely went on the supposition that he was acting on his convictions Therefore, &c.

D I distinguish the Major Acting on his convictions, so as never to do what he believes to be forbidden, *I grant*, so as always to use all liberty that he possesses, *I deny* But they went on the supposition that he was doing what he knew to be forbidden, *I deny*, on the supposition that whatever he did not do, he believed to be forbidden, *I grant*

O But at any rate, St Paul treated St Peter as an inferior: therefore, St. Peter was not Primate.

D. I deny.

O. He treats another as inferior who blames him. But St Paul blamed St. Peter. Therefore, &c.

I distinguish the Major Blames him by way of authority, and without any indication of respect, *I grant*. By way of charitable warning, and with indications of respect, *I deny*. And *I counter-distinguish the Minor*, Blamed him by way of authority and without showing respect, *I deny*, otherwise, I grant, and refer to Galat i 18 and ii 13.

O. But the Fathers thought the incident as narrated inconsistent with Petrine Primacy, and I prove it.

What Fathers most renowned as interpreters of Holy Scripture taught is the interpretation of the Fathers But such Fathers thought the incident as inconsistent. Therefore, &c.

D. I distinguish the Major: Taught as witnesses of traditional interpretation, *I grant*. taught as their own conjecture, *I sub-distinguish:* Deserves respectful consideration, *I grant*. Is the unanimous voice of the Fathers which demands assent, *I deny*. To the Minor, *I deny*.

O. I prove the Minor.

When skilled interpreters adopt far-fetched and inconsistent explanations of a text, it is a sign that they feel that the *prima facie* meaning of the text is against them But Clement of Alexandria adopted one such explanation, St Jerome and St. Chrysostom another. (n 278) Therefore, &c.

D I distinguish the Major: And they hereby showed that their own belief was opposed to the *prima facie* meaning, *I grant*. otherwise, *I deny* To the Minor, *I distinguish*, and they hereby showed that they believed in the Primacy and Infallibility,

INDEX.

The references are to the paragraphs indicated at the top of each page at the inner margin

Abgar, King 79
Accommodation 61
Acquired Habits 309, xi.
Acts of Martyrs 96
Advocate, Devil's 268
Albigenses 168
Alexamenes 97
Alexander Severus 68
Alexandria 152
Allies quoted 269, 286
Allusions, Prophetic 63
Almsgiving 70
Antiochus 58
Anti-Popes 189
Apocrypha 120, 149
Apocryphal Gospels 49.
Apologetics 6
"Apostle" 243
Apostles, Action of the 81
" Charge to the 80
" Revelation closed with the 78
Apostolic Succession 246, 252
Apostolicity of the Church 243—247, 254, 257
Appeals to Rome 269
Approbation of Books 160
Aquilas 152, 155
Archæology 97
Argyll quoted 272
Arithmetic, Mistakes in 313
Arius, Thalia of 203
Ark, Noe's 181
Articles, The Thirty-nine 78, 150, 204
Ascetic Theology 4
Athanasian Creed 252
Auctorem Fidei, The Bull 169, 189, 202, 205, 208, 211
Augustine, Authority of St 101
" on the Creation 159
" and St Cyprian 100
" Seal of 223
Aurelian, The Emperor 216

"Babylon" or Rome 272.
Baius 101
Baptism 181, 188, 195
" of Infants 107
"Baptists" 251
Basil, St 107
Beatification 211, 231, 255, 267
"Belief" 309, vii
Benedict XIV 37, 211, 231, 255
Benefit of Clergy 302
Bethlehem 60
"Be with you" 80
"Bible" 118 See Scripture.
Bible-reading 160
Bible Societies 156, 157, 160
Bishop, Universal 287
Bishops 201
" Anglican and Methodist 251, 252
" and People 103.

Bishops and Pope 266, 268 294—299
" and Unity 281
Bithynia, Christian in 41, 71
Blackstone quoted 302
Blessed, The 184
Blood, Eating 107
Body of Christ, The Church the 177
Body of the Church 186, 188
Boedder referred to 33
Books, Condemnation of 203
Bradshaw quoted 168
Branch Churches 219 226, 252
Browne on the Articles 89—91 107
Burnet on the Articles 205

Cabbala 132
Canon of Scripture 148—153
" Doubts concerning the 113
" The Vincentian 114
Canonical 127
Canonization 211, 231, 255, 267
Canons, The Apostolic 221
Cardinals 268
Carthage, Council of 151, 152
Catechumens 195
Cathari 168
Catholic Doctrine 327
"Catholic," Meaning of 238, 251 258
Catholicity 237—242, 256
Celestine, Pope St 95
Censures 328
"Cephas" 278
"Certain" 74
"Certitude" 309, I., 313, 319
Chaldee 120
Chillingworth 78, 87
Christ charges His Apostles 80
" Head of the Church 177
" Prophet, Priest, and King 202
" wrote nothing 79
Christian Revelation certain 75
" Writings 44
Christianity, Supernatural 13
Church, The 162—259
"Church" Meaning of 164, 201
Church and Churches 164, 165
Church perpetual 167 207
" visible 168 169
" existed early 31
" Head of the 177 181
" Supernatural 176
" Duty to belong to 181
" No Salvation outside 181
" as a Society 175 179
" Members of 183—198
" Figures of 185
" Soul and Body of 186
" Constitution of 203—212
" Old 213—217 254
" The Established 252
" Holy 228—230 255
" Catholic 237—242 256
" Apostolic 243—247 257
" Notes of the 238—259
" Infallible 205—211
" Proposal by the 327
" and State 301
Churches, Apostolic 83
" Branch 219 226 252
Cisalpine 290
Clement St quoted 82
Clement of Alexandria 51
Clergy, Benefit of 302
Commeriorium 114
Communion, Holy 221
Conception The Immaculate 94
Concordats 303
Congregations, Roman 268, 328
Consecration in Mass 95
Conservation of Energy 33
Constance, Council of 217, 298
Constantine the Great 67
Constantinople, Council of 88
"Consubstantial" 211
"Consummation of the world" 206
Conversion of Empire 67
" Graces needed for 316
Conversions Motives of 313
Copernican Astronomy 159
Corinth, Disorders at 216
Cornelius Pope St 189

Corrupt Translation 156
Corruptions of Scripture 132
Councils 296
Creation Days of 159
Credibility of Gospels 51
" Motives of 313
"Credible' 309 ix
Creed, The Apostles' 244
" Nicene 166
" Athanasian 252
" Additions to 226
Cross, Invention of the 96
" Vision of the 67
" Worship of the 96, 97
Cyprian, St 11., 269, 272, 292, ii
" and St Augustine 100
Cyril, St , of Alexandria 100
" of Jerusalem 96

Daniel, his Prophecy 58, 59
" his four Kingdoms 168
Decretals, False 292, vi
Definitions of Faith 94
Degradation 302
Deists 36
Demonic Agency 36
Deuterocanonical 120, 149, 152
Development of Doctrine 110—115
"Devil's Advocate" 231
Diatessaron 51
Difficulties against Miracles 31—39
Diptychs 222
Dispensations, Papal 265
"Doctor," Meaning of 102
Doctrine, Channel of 76—115
"Dogma" 4
Dogmatic Facts 211
" Theology 4
Donatists 133, 168, 189, 191, 217
"Doubt" 309, iii
" as to Faith 317

Eastern Church 250, 253
Ecumenical Councils 297
Elders 201
Electricity 323
Encyclical on Scripture 145
Energy, Conservation of 33
Ephesus, Council of 226
Epiphanius, St 107
Episcopal Government 295
"Erroneous" 328
Error, none in Scripture 145, 156
Errors on Church Membership 189 192
Established Church of England 252
Evangelicals 216
"Evidence' 309, viii
Ex Cathedra 290
Exclusiva 262
Exequatur 304
Excommunication 68, 196.
Expectations, Vague 57
Extraordinary Jurisdiction 268

Faber, Dr 211
Facts, Dogmatic 211.
Faith 31, 307—329
" Cures 37
" Rule of 78, 87, 89, 325—329
" Meaning of 310
" Errors concerning 311
" Analysis of 312
" Obligation of 316
" Freedom of 316
" Certainty of 319
" Doubts as to 317
" in God 315
" Divine, Catholic, Ecclesiastical 326
" in Mysteries 323
" Unity of 220
Family 175, 179
"Fathers" 98
" as Judges and Witnesses 159
" on Rule of Faith 91
Febronius 189
Feet-washing 107
Ferrusola quoted 189
Figurative Language 225, iv
Figures of the Church 185, 188
Filioque 166, 226
Firmilian 269, 272
Florence, Council of 136

"Foreknown" 184
Forum, Internal and External 268
Foundation, St Peter 274, 282
Fraticelli 111, 189
Fulfilments of Prophecy 61
Fundamentals 219 226
Fundamental Theology 6

Galileo 159, 292, viii
Gallicanism 290 304
Gallican Liberties 269
Gelasius 151
General Councils 297
Geology 159
Gibbon's Five Causes 68
God unchangeable 33
Gospel Miracles 46
Gospels, The Four 45
" when written 48—53
" Apocryphal 49
Government of Church 200—202
" Unity of 215, 224
"Grace" 309, xii
" Miracles of 25
" Need of 318
Graces gratuitously given 235
Gregory of Nazianzum, St 100

Habbakuk 97
"Habit" 309, x, xi
Heathen and Scripture 133.
Helena, St 96
Heresy 193
" and Schism 216.
"Heretical" 328
Heretics 193
" Children of 194
" and Scripture 133
Heroes, Heathen and Christian 231
Heroic Sanctity 231
Hexapla 152
Hierarchy, Divine 202
Hilary of Poitou 100
"Holiness" 229, 230
Honorius, Pope 292, v.
Hus 189

Idolatry 70
" charged against the Church 168
Ignorance 309, ii
Imitation of Christ 144
Immunity 302, 305
Independents 201
Infallibility of Church 205 206
" Papal 268 289—293
Infanticide 70
Infused Habits 309 xi
Innocent I, Pope St 151
Inquisition, The Spanish 258
Inspiration 135—147
" False Views on 144
" Verbal 143
" Encyclical on 145
Interpretations of Scripture 154
Irenæus, St 51, 82, 112, 157.
" on Unity 224
Irving 111
Irvingites 78

Jansenists 189 211
Jansenius 101
Jeremias 61
Jerusalem, Council of 220, 292, ii
Jerome, St 207
" on the Canon 151.
Jewish Church 220
Jews 71
" and Scripture 131.
Joachim 111
Joan, Pope 262
"Joannites" 222
John, Anecdotes of St 99.
" on Love 14
Josephus 57, 137
Julian the Apostate 223
Jurisdiction, Ordinary 268
"Just" 184 191
Justification 184
Justin, St 51, 67

Keys, Power of the 274, 283.
Kraus quoted 97

Lapsed The 71, 133
Laws of Nature 33, 35
Legislation by Pope 265

Letters 223
Libellatici 133, 189
Liberius, Pope 292, iv
Liberties, Gallican 304
Liguori, St Alphonsus 102
Literæ Formatæ 223
Liturgy 95 267
Lost, The 184
Lourdes 38
Loyola, St Ignatius of 189.
Lucian quoted 223
Luther 189

Maher referred to 51
Manes 111
Manicheans 14, 19
Manicheism 136
Manuscripts 49
Marcellus of Ancyra 166
Marriage indissoluble 107
Marshall's *Christian Missions* 156, 157, 256
Martyrs 71
„ as heroes 231
„ Acts of 96
Mary, The Blessed Virgin 70
Mass, Rite of the 254
Melchisedech 143
Melito 152
Members of the Church 183—198, 232
Messianic Prophecies 58—63, 69
Metaphysical Certainty 74
Methodists, 216, 251
Micheas 60
Milton 168
Miracles 23—26
„ Objections to 28, 32
„ Criteria of 37
„ Physical 24
„ as Credentials 47
„ False 36
„ of Sinners 235
„ Moral 65—72
„ Modern 38, 211, 235, 255
Missions, Foreign 256
Monarchy, The Church a 199
Montanus 111
Moral Certainty 74
„ Miracles 65—72.
Moral Theology 4
„ Virtues 314
Morality, Christian 68, 70
Muratori 51
Murray, Dr 192, 196, 207
Mysteries 4 16
„ and Faith 323
Mystic Theology 4

"Nations" 297
Nero 42
Nice, Council of 88
Notaries, Roman 96
Notes of the Church 248—259
Novatian Miracle 36
Novatians 189

Oaths 107
Objections 207, 225, 234, 258, 292.
"Ordinary" jurisdiction 268
Origen 152
"Opinion" 309, v.
Osee 61

Paley 37
Pallium 266
Papal Infallibility 289—293
Papias 51
Paris, Abbé 36
Pastor quoted 266
Paul, Epistles of St 44
„ St, and St Peter 277, 278
Paul of Samosata 216
Pentateuch 119
Peregrinus 223
Perennity of the Church 166, 167
Peter, St 271—279
„ at Rome 272.
„ his Fall 292, i
„ the Rock 274
„ and St Paul 277, 278
Philo 137
Philosophy 5, 6
Physical Certitude 74
„ Miracles 24
Pistoia, Synod of 189, 211
Placitum Regium 304
Plenary Councils 296
Pliny 41, 71
Polemics 6, 84.

Pope The 260—306
,, Election of 262
,, Functions of 263
,, Who is 262
,, resigning 262
,, as Teacher 264
,, and Bishops 266 258, 29; —299)
,, Freedom of the 305
Porphyry 14
Positive Theology 6 84
Power, The Temporal 300—306
Predestined " 184, 190
Prelatic Sects 250, 252
Presbyterians 201, 216
Prescription 83 88, 269
Priests, not Judges of Faith 208
Primacy, Papal 280—288
Primitive Christianity 14
Princes, Excommunication of 302
" Probability ' 309, vi.
Properties 214
Prophecies 27, 55—64
Prophets, False 111
Protestants, Number of 252
Protocanonical 149
Provisions, Papal 266
' Proximate to Heresy " 328
Psalms Titles of the 121
Ptolemaic Astronomy 159.
Purity, Christian 70

Quakers 78
Quesnel 189

' Rash " 328
Rationalists 31
Reason 31
,, and Revelation 322
Revelation 16
,, Modes of 18
,, Craving for 19
,, Public 23 326
,, Private 22, 203, 290 326
,, Close of 112 167
,, Certitude of 313
,, and Reason 322
Rickaby, John 309
Rickaby Joseph 309
Ritual 95
Rock and Peter 274
" Roman Catholic " 218
Roman Church its Notes 254—258
Rome, Communion with 308
Rome s Delays 269
Rule of Faith 78 87 89

Sabbath 107
Sacrificati 133
Saints 231
Saints Lives 255
Salutary Acts 318
Salvation, None outside the Church 181
Sancta Romana 168
Sanctity, Heroic 231
, of the Church 228—236 255
Schism 197 216
,, and Heresy 216
,, The Great 218
,, Time of 297, 298
Scholastic Theology 6, 84
Schools of Theology 113, 220
Scriptural Language 86
Scripture, Holy 116—161
" Scripture ' 118, 127
,, and Tradition 78, 105—115
,, Interpretation of 159
,, on the Rule of Faith 89
Septuagint 152
Shepherd, St Peter 276, 285
Sin 184
Sinners 184, 191
Slavery 70
Sleepers The Seven 67
Smith a False Prophet 111
Societies classified 174, 179
Sotades 203
Soul of the Church 186, 178
State 175 179
,, and Church 301
Stephen Pope St 269, 292, 11
Success Worldly 233.
Succession Apostolic 246, 252

Suetonius 57
Sulpicius Severus 96
Sunday 107
"Suspected of Heresy" 328
"Supernatural" 13
,, The Church 176
"Suspicion" 309, iv
Swedenborg 111.
Synagogue 220
Syriac 120
,, Gospel 274

Tacitus 42, 57, 71
Tatian 51
Teaching by Authority 203, 204
Temporal Power, The 300—306
Tertullian 51, 67, 71, 157
,, on Unity 223
Testimony 34
Tests of Unity 223
Thalia of Arius 203
Theatres, Heathen 70
Theodotion 152
"Theology" 2
,, Divisions of 4, 6
,, The Work of 84
,, Advancing 113
,, Schools of 113
Thomas, St, on Miracles 235
,, on Infallibility 291
Thurificati 133
Tradition 76—115, 140
,, of Men 80
,, and Scripture 105—115
,, Monuments of 93—104
,, indispensable 108
Traditores 133, 189
Translations 89, 155, 156
"Transubstantiation" 211
Trent, Council of 78, 136
,, ,, on the Canon 150
,, ,, on the Vulgate 157.
Truth, Oneness of 322
Type and Antitype 61

Ultramontane 290
Unanimity, Tests of 99
Unigenitus, The Bull 160, 189, 196
Unitarians 166
Unity of the Church 213—227, 254
,, Tokens of 83, 223
,, Catholic Doctrine on 215
,, Errors as to 219, 226
,, Rival Views on 226
,, Centre of 281
Universal Bishop 287
Unprelatic Sects 250

Vatican Council 16, 19, 28, 75, 136, 290
Verbal Inspiration 143
Versions 50
, of Scripture 154—161
,, The Authorized and Revised 156
Vespasian 57
Veto at Papal Elections 262.
Vincentian Canon 114
Virtue 231
Visibility of the Church 168, 169
,, Difficulties against 170
Viva 101
Vulgate, The 158

Waldenses 168
War 70
Ward's *Errata* 156
Weeks, The Seventy 58
Witnesses, Single 100
"With you" 206
Woman, Position of 70
Worship, Unity of 215, 221.
Wyclif 189

PRINTED BY BENZIGER BROTHERS, NEW YORK